DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 054 876 RC 001 975

TITLE	Rural Poverty, Hearings Before the National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty (Tucson, Arizona, January 26-27, 1967).
INSTITUTION	National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Sep 67
NOTE	409p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$16.45
DESCRIPTORS	*Agricultural Laborers; *American Indians; Community; Depressed Areas (Geographic); *Economic Disadvantagement; Family Planning; *Government Role; Health; Housing; Information Seeking; Jobs; Manpower Development; Mexican Americans; Organization; *Rural Areas; Rural Development; Rural Education; Rural Population; Unemployment; Welfare Services

ABSTRACT

On September 27, 1966, President Lyndon B. Johnson established the National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty. To this commission, he delegated the responsibility of making a comprehensive study and appraisal of the current economic situations and trends in American rural life. In fulfilling this responsibility, the National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty conducted public hearings in Tucson, Arizona; Memphis, Tennessee; and Washington, D.C. The verbatim transcript contained in this volume is a result of the 2-day public hearing in Tucson on January 26-27, 1967; at these hearings, witnesses representing American Indians and migrant workers were among those who testified. Two additional volumes contain the proceedings of the hearings in Memphis (RC 001 945) and Washington, D.C. (RC 002 004). All 3 volumes of hearings conducted by this commission are verbatim transcripts of the respective hearing proceedings. Based upon these public hearings and other extensive research, the commission presented a final report to President Johnson on September 27, 1967. The final report, which is contained in another volume (ED 016 543), describes the poverty in America in 1967 and recommends "the most efficient and promising means of providing opportunities for the rural population to share in America's abundance." (LS)

ED0 54876

RURAL POVERTY

RECEIVED
DEC 22 1967
NMSU
E.R.I.C.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Hearings

Before the

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMISSION

on

Rural Poverty

Tucson, Arizona

Grand Ballroom, Pioneer International Hotel
January 26 and 27, 1967

Washington, D. C.

Issued September 1967

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMISSION ON RURAL POVERTY

Membership of the Commission

James T. Bonnen
Edward T. Breathitt (Chairman)
David W. Brooks
Sara R. Caldwell
Lawrence A. Davis
Neil O. Davis
John Fischer
Thomas R. Ford
Herman E. Gallegos
Connie B. Gay
James O. Gibson
Vivian W. Henderson
Francis S. Hutchins
Kara V. Jackson
Lewis J. Johnson
W. Wilson King
Oscar M. Laurel
Winthrop C. Libby
Carlyle Marney
Thomas W. Moore
Robert A. Roessel, Jr.
James Earl Rudder
J. Julian Samora
Miles C. Stanley
John Woodenlegs

Commission Staff

Executive Director	C. E. Bishop
Associate Director	George L. Wilber
Assistant to Executive Director	Lawrence S. Stinchcomb

W. B. Back
W. Keith Bryant
Cleveland A. Chandler
Lynn M. Daft
Clifton R. Jones
J. Patrick Madden
George M. Stephens, Jr.
Gooloo S. Wunderlich

Administrative Staff

J. Gayle Carpenter
Marian C. Carter
Florentine Ford
Mary Thomas Fox
D. Jacklyn Harris
Marjorie L. Henricks
Linda G. Hogberg
Marcelle Masters
Edna Raymond
E. Anne Reed
Meldanette M. Richardson
Velma Tachovsky
LaDene Hester

FOREWORD

On September 27, 1966, President Lyndon B. Johnson established the National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty. To this Commission he delegated the responsibility of making a comprehensive study and appraisal of the current economic situations and trends in American rural life. In fulfilling this responsibility the National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty conducted public hearings in Tucson, Ariz.; Memphis, Tenn.; and Washington, D. C. The verbatim transcript contained in this volume is a result of the two days of public hearings in Tucson, on January 26 and 27, 1967. There are two additional volumes which contain the proceedings of the hearings in Memphis and Washington. All three volumes of the hearings conducted by this Commission are verbatim transcripts of the respective hearing proceedings.

Based upon these public hearings and other extensive research, the National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty presented a final report to President Johnson on September 27, 1967. This final report, which is contained in another volume, describes the poverty in rural America today and recommends the most efficient and promising means of providing opportunities for the rural population to share in America's abundance.

ABBREVIATIONS USED

AEC	Atomic Energy Commission
AFDC	Aid to Families With Dependent Children
AFL-CIO	American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations
ARA	Area Redevelopment Administration
BAT	Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training
BES	Bureau of Employment Security
BIA	Bureau of Indian Affairs
CAA	Community Action Agency
CAC	Community Action Council
CAP	Community Action Program
CCC	Civilian Conservation Corps
COPE	Committee on Political Education
CORE	Congress of Racial Equality
EEOC	Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
EDA	Economic Development Act
EOA	Economic Opportunity Act
FEP	Fair Employment Practices
FHA	Farmers Home Administration
GED	General Equivalence Diploma
HEW	U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
HUD	U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
IBEW	International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers
JAC	Joint Apprenticeship Committee
MDTA	Manpower Development Training Act
MIT	Massachusetts Institute of Technology
MOP	Migrant Opportunity Program
NAACP	National Association for the Advancement of Colored People
NASA	National Aeronautics and Space Agency
NLRA	National Labor Relations Act
NLRB	National Labor Relations Board
NYC	Neighborhood Youth Corps
OED	Office of Economic Development
OEO	Office of Economic Opportunity
OJT	On-the-Job Training
PTA	Parent-Teachers' Association
RAD	Rural Areas Development
RDC	Rural Development Corporation
RCA	Radio Corporation of America
SBA	Small Business Administration
SBDC	Small Business Development Center
UCLA	University of California at Los Angeles
USDA	U.S. Department of Agriculture
USPHS	U.S. Public Health Service
VA	Veterans' Administration
VISTA	Volunteers In Service To America
YWCA	Young Women's Christian Association

CONTENTS

January 26, 1967

WITNESSES: *Page*
E. S. Krackov, executive director, Tulare County Community Action Agency, Inc., Calif 3
Tony Orona, farmworker, Stanfield, Ariz 24
Mrs. Leford Harry, worker in migrant opportunity program, Marana, Ariz 30
Leonard Miguel, farmworker, Marana, Ariz 38
Vanilla Sanders, wife of farmworker, Marana, Ariz 42
Harland Padfield, assistant professor of anthropology and research specialist, University of Arizona 51
Michael Peevey, director of research, California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO 66
Herbert M. Greer, vice president, Burnell-Nytronics, Laguna, N. Mex 82
Howe Moffatt, Four Corners Economic Development Region, Salt Lake City, Utah 85
Eloy Chavez, reported on Symposium on Migratory Workers in Colorado held March 12, 1966 103
Ronnie Lupe, chairman, White Mountain Apache Tribe, Fort Apache Indian Reservation, Ariz 122
Peter MacDonald, Office of Navajo Economic Opportunity, Window Rock, Ariz 131
Wendell Chino, president, Mescalero Apache Tribe, N. Mex 142
Adelaida Rodriquez, Yaqui Tribe, Guadalupe, N. Mex 148
Agustin Aguilar, Santo Domingo Pueblo, N. Mex 154
Benito Garcia, Papago Tribe, Sells, Ariz 163
Mamie Sizemore, consultant, State Department of Public Instruction, Phoenix, Ariz 168
Edward Samora, State director, League of United Latin American Citizens, Mesa, Ariz 181
Facundo Raul Rodrique, State supervisor, Work Experience and Training Program, Santa Fe, N. Mex 186
Lee E. Lukson, director, Yakima Valley Council for Community Action, Inc., Yakima, Wash 196
Tom E. Martinez, director, Community Service Center, Bakersfield, Calif 209

January 27, 1967

Norman H. Todd, executive director, Committee for Economic Opportunity, Inc. (Tucson and Pima County, Ariz.) 215
George L. Phearson, director, On-the-Job Training—Mobility, Migrant Opportunity Program, Phoenix, Ariz 222
Alex P. Mercure, State program director, Home Educational Livelihood Programs, Albuquerque, N. Mex 229

Page
Raymond Marshall, professor of economics, University of Texas 235
Frank Mares, Taos County (N. Mex.) Community Action Program 265
Raymond L. Johnson, executive director, Los Angeles Area Economic Development Agency 270
Mrs. Willie Anderson, teacher's aid, Tucson, Ariz 279
Arthur Hawkins, community worker in Richmond (Calif.) Community Development Administration Project 286
Edwin P. Stephenson, executive director, North Richmond (Calif.) Neighborhood House 293
Ella G. Rumley, Division of Indian Health, U.S. Public Health Service, Tucson, Ariz 300
Jorge Acevedo, deputy director, Economic Opportunity Commission of Santa Clara County (Calif.), Inc 303
Arthur L. Campa, sociologist, Denver University 311
James D. Lorenz, Jr., and Daniel Lund, California Rural Legal Assistance 317
Henry J. Casso, Bishop's Committee for the Spanish Speaking, San Antonio, Tex 351
Nanny Nish, off-reservation member of Hopi Tribe, Kingman, Ariz 368
Elizabeth Clark, volunteer worker, Association on American Indian Affairs, Billings, Mont 372

Material Submitted for the Record

Willard Abraham, Arizona State University 377
George Bryant, Fort Yuma, Ariz., CAP 383
Leonard C. Burch, tribal chairman, Southern Ute Tribe, Colorado 384
Tommy Clayton, Marana, Ariz 386
Marcus Coriz, CAP employee, Santo Domingo Pueblo, N. Mex 387
Jean M. Emrick, Tucson, Ariz 387
Elsie Fulwilder, mother of eight children, Tucson, Ariz 389
Dean Hines, Confederated Tribes and Bands, Yakima Indian Nation, Toppenish, Wash 390
Everett Jackson, unemployed, Sacaton, Ariz 390
Kern County Community Action Program Committee, Inc., Bakersfield, Calif 391
Helen Mitchell, recording secretary, National Congress of American Indians, Oakville, Wash 391
W. F. Murison, director, Center for Community Development, Arcata, Calif 392
Henry Olohi, executive secretary, Confederated Tribes, Colville Reservation, Nespelem, Wash 396
Mose E. Parris, Public Health Service, Indian Health Area Office, Phoenix, Ariz 397
Walter Richter, director, Southwest Region (Texas) OEO 398
Phil Warren, Shoshone & Arapahoe Tribes, Fort Washakie, Wyo 400
Wm. W. Welsh, executive director, Mohave County (Ariz.) Development Council 401
Angus A. Wilson, chairman, Nez Perce Tribal Executive Committee, Lapwan, Idaho 402

HEARINGS BEFORE THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMISSION ON RURAL POVERTY

TUCSON, ARIZ.

January 26, 1967

Chairman Oscar M. Laurel: Please come to order.

Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. I will first introduce myself.

I am Oscar Laurel, and by virtue of an appointment by the Honorable Edward T. Breathitt, Governor of Kentucky and chairman of this Commission, I will have the privilege of presiding over the hearing which we shall conduct here today.

First, by way of introducing myself, I am the district attorney for the Forty-Ninth Judicial District of Texas. I live in Laredo, Tex., right on the border, and on the banks of the Rio Grande.

I will have the honor of introducing the other members of the Commission. The distinguished members of this Commission come from all walks of life, and they have a real interest in and compassion for some of the problems that we will be hearing of today. We will be hearing from some of the members here today, and they will bring to bear some of the wonderful work that we expect from them.

First of all, the gentleman on my extreme right is Dr. Robert A. Roessel, Jr., director, Rough Rock Demonstration School, Rough Rock, Ariz.

Next, Mr. James Bonnen, professor of economics, Michigan State University.

Next, Mr. Neil Owen Davis, editor and publisher, The Lee County Bulletin in Alabama.

Mr. John Fischer, editor in chief, Harper's Magazine.

Mr. Connie B. Gay, president and chairman of the board, Connie B. Gay Broadcasting Corporation; and, may I add, a very recent and proud father of a new addition. Is that right, Connie?

Mr. Gay: That is correct, 7 pounds 11 ounces, a girl.

The Chairman: Congratulations.

Mr. Gay: There will be cigars later.

The Chairman: Immediately to my right is Mr. James O. Gibson, staff associate, Potomac Institute, Washington, D.C.

Immediately to my left is Dr. Vivian W. Henderson, President of Clark College, Atlanta, Ga.

We have Mr. Lewis J. Johnson, president, Arkansas Farmers Union, and secretary-manager, Farmers Union Mutual Insurance Company.

Mr. W. Wilson King, breeder of registered Angus cattle, Kinglore Farms, Inc., from Illinois.

Mr. John Woodenlegs, president of the Northern Cheyenne Tribal Council, from Montana.

Now I see Dr. Davis, and will you please come forward, Dr. Davis. I did not see you.

Dr. Lawrence Arnette Davis, president, Agricultural, Mechanical and Normal College, Pine Bluff, Ark. We are glad to have you with us, Dr. Davis.

Taking her position here to my left is Kara Vaughan Jackson, director of student personnel services and professor of education, Grambling College, Grambling, La.

Also, now taking his seat to my extreme left is Mr. Miles C. Stanley, assistant to the president, AFL-CIO, Dunbar, W. Va.

I would like to welcome all of you who have come to this hearing, the first to be conducted by the National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty.

This Commission was created by Executive order of President Lyndon B. Johnson last fall for the specific purpose, among others, and we quote:

> To make a comprehensive study and appraisal of the current economic situation and trends in American rural life as they relate to the income and community problems of the rural areas.

These hearings were designed to obtain testimony which would be helpful to the Commission in the development of recommendations concerning the improvement in the economic and social well-being of people living in rural areas, and those who move from rural to urban areas.

The second hearing will be held in Memphis, Tenn., February 2 and 3; and the final hearing will be held in Washington, D.C., on February 15, 16, and 17.

We ask that those who are presenting their views today please bear in mind that the Commission's responsibilities concern national policies. It is necessary that we take a broad view to fulfill this responsibility.

As the presiding officer, I am requested to take all action necessary to insist that proper conduct be adhered to. In that connection, you will be expected to maintain the same decorum here that you would maintain in any courtroom in this State or Nation. So there will be no applauding, please, or any other demonstrations of any kind.

The testimony given here will be reported verbatim.

Now just a few words about the procedural guidelines.

Within the limits of time available here today, the Commission has attempted to schedule those witnesses whose interests and feelings on rural poverty are representative of the various significant viewpoints.

Although we will not be able to receive all oral testimony from all interested parties, we recommend that all others submit testimony in writing by sending it to the National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty, Room 501, 1634 I Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.

The written testimony submitted and the testimony received from those appearing before us today will receive equal consideration by the Commission.

I am going to ask each witness, as he or she is called, to begin their testimony by stating their name and address.

The person making the statement from the witness stand will not be sworn in. There will be no cross-examination. There will be questions, however, by the members of the hearing panel and by members of the Commission present, as time allows. I am sorry that the press of time is such that it will not allow for questions and discussion from others present.

We will now hear from our first witness.

Our first witness is the executive director of Tulare County Community Action Agency, Inc., County Civic Center, Visalia, Calif.

Now, your name is Everett S. Krackov?

MR. KRACKOV: Yes, that is correct, and I am ready to proceed.

The CHAIRMAN: How do you pronounce your name, sir?

Mr. KRACKOV: It is pronounced the way it is spelled, Krackov, and I live at 2545 Border Lane Road in Visalia.

The CHAIRMAN: All right, sir, you may proceed to give your statement.

Mr. KRACKOV: As well as representing my agency, I am also here representing the San Joaquin Valley Community Action directors of Dade County, Calif.

STATEMENT OF E. S. KRACKOV

Mr. KRACKOV: My name is E. S. Krackov and I am executive director of the Tulare County Community Action Agency, Inc. I am also representing the San Joaquin Valley CAP directors.

It is probably very fitting that we meet here in Tucson. It was exactly 2 years ago this date, January 26, 1965, that the National Conference on Poverty in the Southwest was held. We arrived here excited and determined—all of us buoyed by a bit of the messianic call to arms in the newly joined battle in the war against rural poverty. If this is a pilgrimage, some of us are returning to visit the graveyard of hopes—and others, perhaps, to drink of the waters of recommitment.

When I speak of rural poverty today, I speak of the poverty of the long valley, the valley of the San Joaquin and the Sacramento.

It is not the poverty of Grannies Branch, Ky., nor is it the poverty of the Long Island potato diggers.

It is the poverty of the westside "racherias," the poverty of the hundred bulging barrios at harvesttime. It is the poverty of some 200,000 seasonal farmworkers in California.

If I were called to account for that which is their common cause, I could only say that the wandering worker, dug in, shelterless, along the winding Sacramento, has at least one bond between his counterpart along the swamps and bayous of the South—and that is lack of money.

With full knowledge that I may be accused of the unpardonable sin of stating a truism, I will say that a poor person is one that doesn't have money. I, however, bow to the latest fad and will hereafter redeem myself by cherishing the latest sociological cant of "lifestyles" of the poor, and will drink deeply of such phrases as "delayed satisfaction," "nonverbal abilities," and so forth.

When we get to the word "rural"—for definition—life is simpler. All problems vanish. In this time, this decade, perhaps this century, the world is made of two parts— one part urban and one part rural.

This wretched dichotomy between urban and rural carried into this day and age is nothing more than an anomaly hanging heavy, a yoke on those who would strive for abolition of so-called separate but equal treatment. It is a tyranny of the census taker, which has defined rural area as any community under 2,500 in population. (It was until the writer, in conjunction with his congressional representatives, was able to change the definition and up same to 5,500 in population for some "rural" programs. Sec. 520—Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965.)

Even though the definition is now 5,500 for some USDA operational programs, the problem still exists for those agricultural rural areas that "fall between the chairs."

In my area, the San Joaquin Valley, the bulk of the farm labor population lives in communities over 5,500 in population, the bulk of the industry and their economy is an agricultural economy, the bulk of the institutions *are* so-called rural in character.

However, we are in limbo. We are neither rural nor metropolitan urban. We are "small potatoes" for the housing and renewal programs of the Housing and Urban Development Acts; the Manpower Development Training Act; the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965; the Health, Education, and Welfare Department programs; some of the Economic Opportunity Act programs; the newly "minted" amendments to the Housing Act; the model cities program; the Small Business Administration programs of loans and economic incentive; and all the other social legislation that gives the more geographically fortunate the promise and the hope to seek remediacy.

It is not a question of amount of population. For instance, Fresno, Calif., is a community of over 175,000 in the San Joaquin Valley, but it lacks any of the Federal and a good many of the State services that would generally accrue to any metropolitan area. It is in the valley and the valley is an agricultural area, a place one goes through when he travels between Los Angeles and San Francisco. (And in the summer a place most devoutly to be avoided.)

Economic Opportunity Act Programs—1966 Amendments and Authorization

Depending on your sexual persuasion, rural community action has been both raped and castrated in our last congressional session. Here are the reasons:

(1) The so-called earmarking of funds has dealt the biggest blow to rural poverty programs, since the particular congressional earmarked programs are urban conceived and urban oriented and fit urban needs and, therefore, diminish the monies and substance that are needed to run rural community action programs.

(2) The earmarking also diminishes the local rural community action programs from a substantive point of view, since both local option and flexibility are necessary for a successful program. The problems of the marginal farmer in Appalachia are not the problems of the harvest hand in Tulare County, nor are they the same problems as that of the urban dropout in the New York slums.

(3) The cutback in appropriations for the Economic Opportunity Act of 1966 falls most heavily on rural areas, since rural areas, because of the lack of resources, and so forth, have been the slowest in getting community action programs started. They had, therefore, very little programing started before reduction in funding, which cutback amounts to about 50 percent of last year's program. Fifty percent of very little is very, very little. This has already sounded the death knell for many rural CAPS and will do so for an additional number in the following months.

(4) While the Economic Opportunity Act program is a little over 2 years old, the slowest areas in which it got started are the rural areas; and the slice in funding also put the proscription on formation of any new community action agencies. This, of course, will have the greatest effect in hurting rural areas.

(5) What funds are left will, of course, go to those communities that have the greatest "political congressional muscle."

Paradoxically, in the 1965 amendments, and even stronger in the 1966 amendments, both the Senate and the House called for a greater stress on helping rural community action programs.

SENATE CONFERENCE REPORT
ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1966
(Page 23)

PART B—Migratory and Seasonal Farmworkers

> The committee has determined that inadequate attention has been given to the development of permanent housing for migratory and seasonal farmworkers who do not have adequate financial resources to obtain loans for homes through other public and private agencies. In such cases the committee believes that some financial assistance through title III-B should be provided to such farmworkers to enable them to qualify for sufficient Farmers Home Administration loans or other loans.
>
> For example, a nonprofit corporation in California (Self-Help Enterprises, Inc.) which is assisting in the erection of ownership housing for seasonal farmworkers, has discovered that some of the workers, although gainfully employed, have a repayment expectation under Farmers Home Administration criteria to qualify for a $5,500 loan when in fact they need a $7,000 loan to acquire the land and construction materials to become a homeowner. In such a case, the director is authorized to make a grant to the worker to attain the needed $7,000. The grant would not be made directly to the worker, but rather would be deposited in a building account supervised by the FHA. The committee expects that such grants should not exceed $1,500 for any individual.

From the above, you will note that their actions belied their words. A limited review of the Congressional Record, during the debate of the Poverty bill in October, reveals such ranting and raving that you would think each legislator was personally violated. With obsequious rhetoric that would do justice to John Barrymore, one would think that succor for rural poverty and problems were just around the corner.

Title III-B Economic Opportunity Act-Assistance to Migrants and Seasonally Employed Agricultural Workers

I will limit my remarks to a brief discussion.

I refer you to my testimony on March 15 in Visalia, Calif., before the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, for further details relating to Section III-B.

This section calls for grants, loans, and loan guarantees to assist migrants in the areas of housing, sanitation, education, and child care.

Suffice it to say the loans and loan guarantees have never been operative and, as I gather, never were intended to be such. As to the substantive areas, except for a few exceptions, only education and child care programs have ever been implemented to any extent.

In housing, except for flash-peak temporary housing in the California migrant plan and technical assistance for self-help housing, no major programs have been implemented, since no "bricks and mortar money" have as yet been allowed. (It is assumed that the "loans and loan guarantees" referred to in the text, this section, refers to support of services to the Housing Section; however, no way as yet has been found to implement same.)

It is obvious that a program of housing that would involve the actual building of units for farm laborers, involving actual bricks and mortar, would take a larger appropriation than the full section has now ($33 million).

It is our recommendation that the Migrant Section of OEO be given this opportunity, by an increased appropriation, to implement something that had been authorized since the inception of the act, that of housing seasonal farmworkers.

Despite the above catalog of truncated hopes, *I still feel that community action vis-a-vis OEO is the "last best hope on earth" for rural renewal on the local level.*

CAC's, or any other mixture of private nonprofit and local public broadly based organizations, can be the bearer as well as the progenitor of change in rural communities where there is a lacuna of citizen involvement. While the strength of a community action program under OEO is their ability to act as a prod, a catalyst, and a burr under the saddle to both the public and the private sector, it is not inconceivable that they could birth newer forms of viable "bearers," albeit these new animals be the melding of the public and the private in rural development corporations.

I would insert a cautionary note, however, that the formation of rural community development corporations that do not have local support and citizen participation can be an onerous carpetbagging crudity that leaves little residue for continued low income, community participation.

The Alternative Mechanisms for Rural Programing

In the latest talk of dismembering the Office of Economic Opportunity in the columns of our daily press, the verbal description of "who gets what"—the bulk of the account of the bloodless hacking—takes only a paragraph or two. At the end of the story is a solitary phrase to round it out, stating "—and the Department of Agriculture will run the rural poverty programs. . . ."

Of the stillborn Rural Community Development Service of the USDA, whose demise could be attributed to a disease called nonappropriation, I note my regrets herewith for the talented and dedicated men who worked hard to see it a reality.

However, I, frankly, could never really see the worth of the program as conceived, nor did I have any faith that the benefits that would accrue to low income people would be more than minimal. I could see it as a glorified RAD—a program which, at least in my rural area, has been little more than a farce.

In all fairness, the program was not given that much of a chance to get off the ground to prove itself. However, I cannot see where a conglomerate of so-called representative disciplines of USDA under the same roof would make any dent in the solutions of rural poverty problems. It will be agency oriented and prone to all the manipulative politics of a bureaucracy, and one of the largest ones at that.

Movement and change must come from an "outside force," one involving citizen participation—something which the USDA has not very successfully implemented in the past—with low income rural peoples.

What would be initiated would merely be the "service center concept." To the uninitiated, a service center is a place where they send a poor person who is having trouble communicating with one bureaucrat, so that he can try to communicate with four more different bureaucrats.

I know, after this testimony, I won't be able to go home—or my friends in the Government Ag office will string me up.

In all seriousness, the Department of Agriculture workers are dedicated, able public servants. So is the postman who delivers my mail every day (or almost every day).

However, it would be ridiculous to imagine the U.S. Postal Service wrestling with the problems of rural poverty and rural renewal just because it traditionally services rural areas. In particular, it would certainly be anomalous for the USDA ever to make any dent in the problems of seasonal farm labor in the San Joaquin Valley.

Traditional agency-run programs, whether it be programs out of USDA, HEW, or elsewhere, often have the bureaucratic bias or horror against "selling their programs." Programs are always "available." The main problem with this is that availability means nothing if people are not aware or knowledgeable about what these programs are intended for.

"Accessibility" is another problem. Accessibility is not merely physical accessibility, but that attitude which allows the potential recipient to feel that he has a right to the service as well as a bond of mutual satisfaction with the one who gives the service.

For the low income person, the farm laborer or urban unemployed, the problems of availability and accessibility are usually greater than for his middle-class counterpart and certainly more critical.

Unblushingly, as a partisan for community action, I will admit to this "selling" of programs and the hopeful thrust to narrow that gap of accessibility and availability.

Specific Remedies—Suggestions for USDA Farmers Home-HUD Programs

The fact that water and sewage loans are available under the Consolidated Farmers Home Act, the fact that rural home loans are available under amendments to the Housing Act, the fact that rehabilitation loans are available for rural housing under legislative authorization, the fact that domestic farm labor housing program is available under Sections 514 and 516 of the Housing Act, and the fact that cooperative loan money is now available to farm labor cooperative housing ventures under the new amendments to Section 515 of the Housing Act are all meaningless and a tragic game to play with the needy, *if there is no appropriation or an inadequate appropriation* to go along with the legislation.

For instance, there is no money in the housing rehabilitation program; there is no money for water and sewage grants in California under P.L. 87–128 until the next fiscal year; there is a $3 million allocation for domestic farm labor housing for this fiscal year, over a million of which the writer personally knows is already committed to two or three projects.

(1) There are some nine communities within Tulare County that have been working for a year on programs for either water or sewage to meet the basic amenities of life. These are low income communities, who were led down the garden path with bureaucratic promises and now must wait, and wait, and wait some more.

(2) In a more minor key, I would like to note that the so-called county committees authorized in Farmers Home legislation to pass on Section 502 rural home loans and sewage and water loans (P.L. 87–128) are generally three farmers picked without the knowledge of nor the acceptance nor the chance for elective franchise by the low income rural population, whose loans they must pass on. In particular, in our area a great number of loans are made under Section 502 as a part of the self-help housing program for low income people. We suggest that the administrative provisions of the Farmers Home Act and the portions of the Housing Act that deal with low income rural housing be changed to involve participation by low income representatives on rural loan committees.

(3) Section 703 of the Housing Act of 1965, the Neighborhood Facilities section, provides grants up to 66⅔ percent (and 75 percent in some cases) to municipalities for the construction of community centers so that programs for the low income, such as health clinics and child care centers, and general service center activities, can be fostered. We would like to recommend these two amendments to this section:

(A) That other than governmental agencies may be eligible for the grant-in-aid, such as private nonprofit groups and, in particular, local community action groups formed under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. The absence of physical facilities in rural areas for any social and health programs is notorious, and this amendment would allow viable local community groups to actively engage in sponsoring a physical facility, particularly when the local county or municipal authorities do not want to assume sponsorship.

(B) I would amend a section to also allow for use of community volunteer and self-help labor as an in-kind portion of the local contribution involved in the present program. At this time, self-help or volunteer labor is not eligible, and in some communities, particularly in farm labor communities, sweat equity or labor is the only commodity its citizens have to "sell."

(4) Allied to the above, the domestic farm labor housing programs under Section 514 and 516 of the Housing Act and the cooperative loan program under Section 805 (P.L. 89–754) should be amended to allow and encourage the use of volunteer and self-help labor, and particularly paid employment opportunities for domestic farm labor during the dearth of work after the harvest season. Obvious benefits accrue by employment itself and pride in

ownership in working on your home or community facility, plus the byproduct of useful vocational training.

(5) As noted elsewhere in this testimony, and reiterated again now, the invidious distinction between urban and rural, where communities of over 5,500 and below 25,000 or 30,000 are in "limbo" because of a no-man's-land of jurisdiction, *should be ameliorated by legislation.*

The Public Works and Economic Development Act

The Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, successor to the ARA, while it notes its involvement with poverty programs in Title I, as far as we know has been used very little in the implementation of rural poverty programs, for seasonal farmworkers particularly.

Also, their criteria for designation as redevelopment areas depends largely on Department of Labor reports on unemployment. Unfortunately, the poverty of seasonal farm laborers and their families cannot be measured in an unemployment statistic. Theirs is a poverty of underemployment, the poverty which grows out of the low wages of the farmworkers as well as the seasonality of their work.

In fact, it is difficult to even statistically gage the income of seasonal farmworkers. There are no benchmarks because of the absence of withholding tax and, in most States, unemployment insurance figures, and the fact that most seasonal farmworkers do not file income tax. It is notoriously well known that taking a survey of seasonal farmworker family income is a difficult task, and one can see a dozen sets of statistics, all different, about the same community.

Because of special problems facing migratory and seasonal farmworkers in a transition period where there is job attrition because of agricultural mechanization, *we herewith recommend the special amendment to the Economic Development Act in order that job development programs be instituted for this group.*

Self-Help Housing Programs in the San Joaquin Valley

This highly imaginative program, an outgrowth of the American Friends Service Committee project in Tulare County, was broadened less than 2 years ago by a grant given to Tulare County Community Action Agency and Self-Help Enterprises, Inc., the successor agency to the AFSC project, for technical assistance for 40 families in building their own homes. Now the project has spread to five counties within the San Joaquin Valley, including that of Tulare.

The program, basically, uses Section 502 of the Housing Act, rural home loans, in a new twist whereby seasonal farm laborers join groups and, with the technical assistance of Self-Help Enterprises, Inc., receive loans at 4 percent interest for 33 years, and join together in using their own sweat equity or labor in building their own homes. Not only does this program give the rural resident and farm laborer the pride of ownership, but it also involves the somewhat ineffable but ever-present strength received through Self-Help, in working together as a community group for a single purpose.

Following is a detailed description of the program on Self-Help

Enterprises, a nonprofit corporation, 220 South Bridge Street, Visalia, Calif. 93277.

Purpose.—The purpose of Self-Help Enterprises is to provide low income families with technical assistance needed to build new homes or renovate and repair existing homes through use of the self-help technique. Thus the objective is to break the costly physical and psychological bonds created by living in dilapidated surroundings.

Giving families the opportunity to build new homes or to renovate and repair their own homes not only improves their family health and safety, it has important byproducts, from an education in the broadest sense, to group participation for decision making, to financial obligations of home ownership. Home construction knowledge is gained, and a sense of accomplishment with successful construction contributes to individual confidence and family pride. The community is also affected. Certain areas are upgraded; the tax base is increased; there are more active permanent residents helping to develop their community.

Need.—The Governor's Advisory Commission on Housing lists 730,000 substandard housing units in California. The rural residential area's incidence of substandard housing is more than double the statewide average. The bulk of California's domestic farm labor forces is supplied from eight San Joaquin Valley counties and two southern counties. Statistical studies of this area indicate that 80 percent of our farm laborers are living in houses that violate normal standards of health, safety, and comfort.

Self-Help Enterprises believes that a nation with half the world's wealth should have all of its families living in safe houses with healthful living space, water, and sanitation. Low income families presently unable to obtain such housing may yet have a chance through the use of the self-help housing technique.

Funding.—Low income rural families want better housing for themselves and are willing to provide their own labor. However, in addition to this valuable labor equity, two more tools are needed to meet their housing problems: (1) long-term, low interest loans for land and building materials, and (2) technical assistance and supervision. Presently 4-percent, 33-year loans are available through the Farmers Home Administration (U.S. Department of Agriculture) rural housing loan program. Other sources of credit are being investigated. Technical assistance and administration is funded largely by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Progress.—The basic soundness of this self-help technique was demonstrated through the successful completion of a pilot project of the American Friends Service Committee in Tulare County. A total of 20 families, in four separate groups, built their own homes. A film, "Six Houses-Six Homes," illustrates the development of this pilot project from the initial meeting stage through actual construction. This 16-mm. Spanish or English narration film is available for showing on request.

Presently, approximately 300 families in five San Joaquin Valley counties (Tulare, Kings, Merced, Fresno, and Stanislaus) are receiving technical assistance from Self-Help Enterprises. Over 20 homes are under construction, 45 homes have been completed, and another 100 homes are scheduled to begin construction by January 1, 1967; other families are in various stages of preconstruction activity. Other counties have expressed interest in forming county committees to implement projects.

FAMILIES.—A typical family who has completed construction has a total family income of $3,700, five children living at home, and has received a $7,200 loan from the Farmers Home Administration. The loan has financed the purchase of a lot and a 1,000-square-foot, modern three-bedroom home, complete with insulation, built-in oven and range, shower over tub, and an evaporative cooler. This family makes 10 payments per year of $39.70 each to the Farmers Home Administration for principal and interest on the loan. The 2 months each year when no loan payment is due, the family pays the property taxes and insurance. The taxes average $180 per year and are paid in two $90 installments. The insurance averages $28 per year. The total yearly cost to the family averages $605, for loan payments, taxes, and insurance.

METHOD.—The family contributes approximately 1,200 hours of its own labor into the construction of the house. This labor is pooled with an average of six other families and all work is performed under skilled supervision provided by Self-Help Enterprises. The families also meet on an average of three times a month for 7 months prior to construction. At these meetings, they discuss such things as: (1) the financial obligations of home ownership, with a banker; (2) factors to consider in picking a home site, with a county planner; (3) building code requirements, with a local building official; (4) and home design and layout, with an architect or contractor. They also develop plans for labor exchange, recordkeeping, work schedules, and so forth. The labor exchange commitment is secured by the group with a second mortgage on the property. Labor of participants is currently valued at $2 per hour.

FUTURE.—Continued expansion of the program is needed over a 5-year period to prove that self-help housing can be a significant method in meeting low income housing needs in California and across the country. We would like to be able to move into urban slum areas, to work with nonfarmworkers as well as farmworkers, and to work with families whose income is not quite sufficient for them to qualify under present financing. These areas are not open to us presently, but need our attention. Self-Help Enterprises is seeking ways to work with these families as well as continuing and expanding the work in progress. In this way Self-Help Enterprises seeks to fulfill the goals for which it was established.

PROGRESS AS OF JANUARY 20, 1967.—Here is a progress report on this organization:

34 homes are completed and occupied (in addition to the 20 AFSC homes)

92 homes are under construction

220 families are in various stages of preconstruction activity.

Since the Farmers Home Administration Section 502 loans are the only source of direct loan funding for this program, and since they only make funds available in areas of 5,500 population or less, we submitted a bill in the last session, H.R. 18476, as follows:

89TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION
H.R. 18476
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
OCTOBER 19, 1966

Mr. Hagen of California introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency

A BILL

To establish a program of mutual and self-help housing in the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, that this Act will be cited as the Mutual and Self-Help Housing Act of 1966.

* * * * * * *

Sec. 2. The purposes of this Act are (1) to make financial assistance available on reasonable terms and conditions to needy low income individuals and their families who, with the benefit of technical assistance and overall guidance and supervision, participate in approved programs of mutual or self-help housing by acquiring necessary land and building materials, providing their own labor, and working cooperatively with others for the provision of decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings for themselves, their families, and others in the area, and (2) to facilitate the efforts of both public and private nonprofit organizations providing assistance to such individuals, to contribute their technical and supervisory skills toward more effective and comprehensive programs of mutual or self-help housing wherever necessary, in both rural and urban areas.

(a) In order to carry out the purposes of this Act, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development is authorized—

(1) to make grants to, or contract with, public or private nonprofit corporations, agencies, institutions, organizations, and other associations approved by him, to pay part or all of the costs of developing, conducting, administering, or coordinating effective and comprehensive programs of technical and supervisory assistance which will aid needy low income individuals and their families in carrying out mutual or self-help housing efforts:

(2) to make loans, on such terms and conditions and in such amounts as he deems necessary, to needy low income individuals participating in programs of mutual or self-help housing approved by him, for the acquisition of land and for the purchase of such other building materials as may be necessary in order to enable them, by providing substantially all of their own labor, and by cooperating with others participating in such programs, to carry out to completion the construction of decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings for such individuals and their families, subject to the following limitations:

(A) there is reasonable assurance of repayment of the loan;

(B) the amount of the loan, together with other funds which may be available, is adequate to achieve the purpose for which the loan is made;

(C) the credit assistance is not otherwise available on like terms or conditions from private sources or through other Federal, State, or local programs;

(D) the loan bears interest at a rate not to exceed 3 per centum per annum on the unpaid balance of principal, plus such additional charge, if any, toward covering other costs of the loan program as the Secretary may determine to be consistent with its purposes; and

(E) the loan is repayable within not more than thirty-three years.

In determining whether to extend financial assistance under paragraph (1) or (2), the Secretary shall take into consideration, among other factors, the suitability of the area within which construction will be carried out to the type of dwelling which can be provided under mutual or self-help housing programs, the extent to which such assistance will facilitate the provision of more decent, safe, and more sanitary housing conditions than presently exist in the area, the extent to which the assistance will be utilized efficiently and expeditiously, the extent to which such assistance will effect an increase in the standard of living of low income individuals participating in the mutual or self-help housing program, and whether such assistance will fulfill a need in the area which is not otherwise being met through other programs, including those carried out by other Federal, State, or local agencies.

(b) As used in this Act, the term "construction" includes the erection of new dwellings, or the rehabilitation, alteration, conversion, or improvement of existing structures.

* * * * * * *

Sec. 4. The Secretary is authorized to establish appropriate criteria and procedures in order to determine the eligibility of applicants for the financial assistance provided under this Act, including criteria and procedures with respect to the periodic review of any construction carried out with such financial assistance.

Sec. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year commencing after June 30, 1966, and ending prior to July 1, 1971, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section. No grant or loan may be made or contract entered into under the authority of this section after June 30, 1971, except pursuant to a commitment or other obligation entered into pursuant to this section before that date.

This bill will do two main things.

We hope to bring in another agency, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, both to fund direct loans for low income people at 3 percent interest, for 33 years, and also to fund appropriate private nonprofit organizations to handle technical assistance in supplying the community coordinators, the construction supervisors, and all other needed staff, in a similar manner to which Title III-B of the Economic Opportunity Act is now doing.

This piece of legislation was in the House Banking and Currency Committee at the end of the last congressional session and was referred by them to HUD for study, and we hopefully look for successful sponsorship of this bill in the current session of Congress. If successful, it will also allow self-help housing programs to be implemented in more urbanized areas.

We also desire to "write in" self-help housing programs as a separate authorization with separate appropriations within the rural sections of the Housing Act, since although Farmers Home Administration has been very supportive and cooperative in this program, the source of loan funds was depleted in the quarter ending December 31, 1966.

Since there is an expanding program in California and other communities, such as Florida, New Jersey, and so forth, there will need to be an adequate supply of loan money for the demand, and both the separate authorization and the separate appropriation would be desirable. It has now proved itself a successful program and, in fact, has been carried on by Farmers Home Administration itself, on a small scale, in New Jersey.

Among the problems are lack of staff on the Farmers Home level, including self-help housing specialists in States where there are such programs. Staff at the local county supervisor level is also a basic need in order to speed up loan processing.

It is also desirable to see a more liberal attitude by Farmers Home Administration in cases where the potential self-help housing recipients are disqualified because of present mortgages on lots and substandard houses they now are living in. They are now disqualified by Farmers Home Administration for building a new house because of this present condition, and we submit that the agency should have the authority to refinance this obligation as a part of the mortgage for land and the new home.

Probably the most important development needed is a program that would enable the lowest income families to participate in these self-help housing projects. This would take either a lower than 4 percent interest rate for the mortgages or an outright grant or subsidy, in order that the low rung of the low income group can afford the monthly payments.

This factor was recognized by the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor in its hearings in Visalia last spring and, in fact, is included in the Senate Conference Report on the Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1966, as follows:

The Tulare County Community Action Agency presents the following arguments for self-help housing amendments to the housing and urban development act.

Those who live in the urban hovel, the rural hut; those thousands who live in the most dilapidated of housing, should have the opportunity to help themselves—to join with their neighbors in building their own homes.

The self-help housing program in California, as in New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Texas, Florida, and other States, is a proven program. From the first American Friends Service Committee sponsored project of 20 homes in Tulare County in 1961, it has grown slowly but solidly over the years where now some 300 families either have built homes, are in different stages of building, or have formed groups prior to the initial stages of construction. In California, this program now covers some five San Joaquin Valley counties.

Housing programs abound in every form within the sections of the omnibus housing act. Among this myriad of programs, *none* encourages the low income family to join in labor with their neighbor to help build their own homes. There are no programs in housing act legislation that deals with the disadvantaged (Title I, P.L. 89–117) that specifically helps low income persons to build their own homes.

Recent legislative hearings on the efficacy of reaching low income people with HUD programs tend to show that the most economically sophisticated of plans, the most triumphant products of "social engineering," often miss their mark and do not serve the people for whom they were intended.

Housing is and always will be basic to the individual and the community he lives in. Even in the most sophisticated societies, there is no work more significant to the individual than fashioning his own shelter, building his own home. This is true of the affluent, as well as the less affluent; with the less affluent there is the added thrust of economic necessity.

Low rent housing, in private or publicly sponsored projects, gives little chance for ownership and less a chance for the only largesse low income families have to give. What are those of slender means to give more appropriate than their "equity of sweat"?

In recent debates on the poverty bill, many critical words were heard about the shortcomings of present programs. Accompanying this tune were many pious pronouncements, including universal huzzahs for self-help programs. One would think the mere words were mouthings and exercises for mandibles, if you read the resultant legislation. Little specific substantive programs were included where one could say people were encouraged to wrestle with poverty with any self-help techniques.

Self-help housing programs, without a source of *direct loans* to the builder at a low interest rate, spread over a large repayment period, cannot survive.

The Farmers Home Administration Rural Home Loan program is now the source of much-needed loan funds. However, this source of help is only for a narrow band of beneficiaries, since Farmers Home cannot service areas that have a population of more than 5,500.

Visalia, Calif., a city of 23,000 in predominantly rural Tulare County, has little decent housing for low income families. There is little housing now eligible for Title I programs under the Housing and Urban Development Act. While this community works with the Department of Housing and Urban Development on water, sewage, and neighborhood facility programs, there is no impetus or encouragement or availability of any low rent or leased housing program funds. Visalia is the image of thousands of cities in the United States mirroring its size and character. These are small cities, not the large urban complexes. People in Visalia would like to join the self-help housing program, as people would in Merced, Fresno, Modesto, Hanford, and other cities of the San Joaquin Valley.

Without a direct loan program from the Department of Housing and Urban Development, they cannot find the funding sources within their means. Specifically, I propose—

(1) An amendment to Title I of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 that would include direct loans to self-help housing participants. Existing legislation, under Title I, addresses itself to specific groups such as the elderly and the handicapped. Those who would benefit from the rehabilitative processes of building their own home for their own families with their neighbors should also be included as beneficiaries. What sets them apart may only be the desire, the willingness to do something for themselves. They should be given the opportunity. These loans should be at the same maximum interest rate of 3 percent.

(2) In order to make the thrust of these benefits primarily for the low income families, the amendment should make an annual income ceiling based on the same principles used in the low rent housing program (Sec. 101). These criteria should include a minimum annual income of $3,000, allowing for $300 per working dependent within the family as an exemption in figuring out annual income.

(3) Since self-help housing techniques are now proven, and since the technical assistance of community coordinators, group coordinators, and construction supervisors are an integral part of the success of the program, I would amend Title I to add another section that would include grants to legitimate nonprofit, self-help housing organizations to cover the expenses of providing technical assistance.

Technical assistance now provided by the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is prone to all the puffs and winds of chance which are characteristic of a new agency. Even more importantly, the self-help housing program depends on long-term servicing of its recipients, who may take some 6 or 7 months to build from the initial stages. Couple this with the vagaries of EOA 12-month funding and one finds little chance for such needed prior and long-term planning.

Beside the massive monolith of existing housing and urban development programs, self-help housing is puny by comparison—puny in cost and puny in grandiose pretensions. It helps a few poor people, people who could never afford a home, people who could never afford to build their own home.

In a recent speech, reported in the press, Mr. Robert Weaver, Secretary of HUD, said that what was missing in the War on Poverty was the "techniques to coordinate human and physical rehabilitation and the will to achieve their full potential."

Self-help housing does all this, and it also builds houses.

The Senate report recommended that grants not to exceed $1,500 for any individual should be authorized by the Office of Economic Opportunity Section III-B in cases where a larger loan is needed. As yet, and perhaps because of the short funding of this section in this fiscal year, this $1,500 "subsidy" has not been implemented.

Note on the Heller Plan

The new clarion call, heard through the land today, is the cry to implement a plan by which certain percentages of Federal tax monies be returned directly to the States to use as they see fit, instead of the so-called grant-in-aid programs that are popular today. Without discussing the feasibility of the program itself, I would like to note how it might affect rural areas.

Using our own State, California, as an example:

(1) In California, a large State where there is a greater mass in urban population and where reapportionment has taken place in the State legislature, it gives the urban representatives an edge, and it is likely that greater stress will be given on the pressing urban problems. (In fact, the Heller plan, as presented, hinged on the fact that there would be reapportionment within the States.)

(2) In recent action by the new administration in California, the one rural-based State-supported service center in Fresno, Calif., was recently obliterated while most of the urban centers were kept.

(3) Federal grant-in-aid programs that have been mandated to run through State agencies have not added largesse to the rural areas in California. As an example, the Title II funds under the Manpower Development Training Act, some $25 million for California, have been allocated in 1967 fiscal year to urban areas almost wholly, for the building of skill centers and the operation thereof. It is likely that in 1968 fiscal year the monies will also be allocated to these same two areas, in order that the Federal Government's "investment" is protected. The State plan for the use of these funds was formulated by the State Department of Employment. Even the recent migrant amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which was handled by the State Department of Education and which is specifically for rural areas, has been allocated to one county in the State for usage in two other counties besides its own.

The Economic Development Act district program, for which the State of California received technical assistance in the amount of approximately $45,000, looks dead as of this writing and the San Joaquin Valley district along with it—another case of the State not taking on responsibilities asked for by local communities.

The so-called allocation game is, of course, a game of the State bone dry and the other fat cats. It is no guarantee that rural areas will be better served by this method of financing programs than by any other method, and the above reasons may indicate just the opposite.

Cooperative Farm Labor Housing Project

Our agency, in conjunction with farm labor tenants at Woodville and Linnell camps in Tulare County, is now working on a landmark project that would involve using funds from the Migrant Section of OEO and from Title VIII, Section 805 of the Demonstration Cities program to put together one of the first farm labor cooperative housing projects in our area.

The program is still too much in the formative stage to inform this Commission about its operational details, but I will be happy to send you a copy of same after it is ready for submission to these funding agencies.

Let me tell you a story of a small town in Tulare County.

The Allensworth Story

In the southwest corner of Tulare County, across the alkali flats, between the benchlands of the coast range and Highway 99, is the community of Allensworth. Allensworth and its citizens at best have always had a tenuous tie to the land.

It is now a community of about 35 families, mostly Negro, whose insubstantial hold has depended upon the presence of water.

Half a century ago, Col. Allen Allensworth, retired Negro Army chaplain recently turned land promoter, joined forces with others and bought land to set up the township of Allensworth. It was to be an all-Negro colony; a haven where one could have a place of his own—a place to raise a family and work the soil.

Parcels of land for farming were sold all over the United States, which fact would surprise no one if he saw the promotional literature. (It was pictured as a veritable Garden of Eden, where bowers of fruit trees greeted the beneficent sun.) The town grew, and it is said there were a few hundred families in Allensworth at one time—with a store, a church, and a school.

Over the years, the water table dropped, as it did over the whole west side of the valley. Families left, and what would remain was desolated buildings, a two-room schoolhouse and fight—a fight for water.

There was always some water in Allensworth—a comparative dribble, a well or two that a few could get a drink from once in a while.

But last July, as if some higher presence took charge to rectify a past mistake, the few wells—one at the school and one in town—were found to have a dangerous level of arsenic by the California State Water Pollution Board. (One part per million to three-tenths of a part per million—the Public Health standard is one hundredth of a part per million.) Other wells examined in the area and others used for irrigation on the larger ranches also had varying degrees of arsenic. These contaminated wells, serving a minimal need at best, were the sources of water for the area.

Moving swiftly, the County Health Department arranged for tank cars to be located in the community, to serve temporary needs for the citizens for drinking water.

It is now the end of January. The tank cars are still there, and the only other change is a little bit of dust stirred up by the stirring of people—people walking around shouting and stomping.

After some 5 years of searching for solutions on where they were going to get water, years of work and talk, and talk some more, they still have found no answer. Now they have a desperate choice to make because of the arsenic.

Under amendments of the Consolidated Farmers Home Act, they are eligible for a grant loan program to build a water system, if a well can be dug to bypass the "poor strata." Their estimate of a system is over $80,000, and even if the community can get up to a 50-percent grant for these systems, it will be too costly for the present citizens to repay the loan.

From time to time, Office of Economic Opportunity officials or State officials have visited Allensworth. They have talked, shook their heads a bit, clucked their tongues, and shook their heads again. Invariably, their answer was the same: "The best thing for these people is to move some place else." (The more gauche say, "What are you doing in the way of compensatory education?") That last remark is a modern-day variation of the theme of "let them eat cake."

The people of Allensworth are not depending on the largesse of the government—that is, they don't expect it anyhow. Some will live there until they die, and some will move away; but none will move on the whim of an outsider, with a whisper of a promise about an unknown Elysium.

It is difficult to see the poverty, the need of Allensworth, without trying to blot out the sight. But blotting out the sight is not the same as blotting out the community. Those who come to preach that Allensworth is an anachronism, that Allensworth is obsolete, confuse their own needs with the community needs, perhaps tinged with a little guilt.

The citizens of the community formed the mutual water company, applied to Farmers Home Administration for a water loan and grant (P.L. 87–128, as amended), did a feasibility study on the water system, and found that the projected cost was too much.

They still have not given up. And they are willing to build it themselves, willing to dig the trenches, lay the pipe, and backfill the trenches. It is doubtful, however, that Farmers Home Administration will allow them to use the self-help system of labor for constructing part of the water system. Added to this dilemma is the fact that there are no more grant monies available to the California-Nevada-Idaho Farmers Home region in this fiscal year, and Allensworth will probably have to wait until after July of this year, if they are to receive any of that grant money.

The main purpose of the Allensworth story, was one of a cautionary note.

If this newly formed Commission is to wrestle with the economic forces in a monolithic fashion, its judgments should recognize all the past commissions whose reports are gathering dust in someone's archives. Its general remedies, be it legislative or otherwise, must take into account the disparity between what is authorized and what is implemented. It must take into account the minuscule needs of 35 families in Allensworth who don't want to move, who have no place to move, along with massive economic remedies.

No one ever cataloged the ills of poverty, without one lost behind some corner, without one hidden behind some dark experience, or without one that is not yet born. All our monolithic remedies can say, legislative and otherwise, is that we know the picture of some zero sum of input-output, we have the system and the model, and we have the choice.

Commissions' findings are but a pale shadow beside the reality of Allensworth.

You now have another page of Federal programs to add to your file, that of the Office of Economic Opportunity. If I may harken

ES 24

back to my opening statement, I am one who comes to Tucson to mourn. After an infancy of short duration, OEO, like the mythical Orpheus, who also sinned against the gods, is now at this very moment as I speak being dismembered. Its limbs are already cast upon the bureaucratic landscape, and any day now expect to see its bloody head, like Orpheus, floating down the pike singing a sad, sad song of farewell.

Now, I would like to add something on Title III-B in relation to the President's budget message that came up the other day. On the one hand, the message talked about the plight of the rural American; and on the other hand, it asked that the appropriation be cut for 1968, or at least it suggested a cut in the program, from $37 million (the figure for last year) to $27 million this year.

Thank you, gentlemen.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Krackov, will you permit some questions now from the members of the Commission?

Mr. KRACKOV: I will be happy to answer any questions.

The CHAIRMAN: All right, we will have questions first of all from members of the Commission.

Mr. King, you may proceed.

Mr. KING: Would you say that if the Farmers Home Administration was liberalized, I mean in the requirement of 5,500 in population, giving ample funds in many of the areas that you have touched upon, do you think they would have perhaps the know-how and the skeleton for the means of implementing the cure for many of the ills that you have discussed so eloquently here this morning?

Mr. KRACKOV: Very frankly, I do not believe so. I am not an expert in USDA history or the Farm Security Administration, but I talk in terms now of farm labor history.

They have had no experience in the sense of working with migrant workers. They have no historical experience.

As an example, they have a program under Title III of the Act on Economic Opportunity Loans.

Our own Community Action Agency is going out in the field and selling that program because the local Farmers Home supervisor doesn't know how to sell the program. He has been asked not to sell the program. These programs are part of the whole guideline book that he has, one of his programs.

Farmers Home Administration has a tremendous amount of money out on operating loans that had nothing to do with the low income or poverty program.

I frankly do not think that this is the agency that can do the job.

The CHAIRMAN: What is your recommendation as to the proper agency?

Mr. KRACKOV: That is a good question.

I, as part of the community action, would like to see a greater amount of stress being given to OEO rural community action. I think, from my slight knowledge, that if the appropriation were there, where it has been implemented, it has been a success.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir.

Mr. GAY: Did I understand you to feel that, by and large, you think the USDA should be kept out of any rural development or rural poverty programs?

Mr. KRACKOV: Sir, I can only talk for our own area and the problems there. When you talk about rural poverty programs, the programs in Appalachia are different from the programs in the San Joaquin Valley. They are as different as night and day.

I am talking about the servicing of farm labor, and they have never been able to do it, except for the Farm Security Administration, which was killed within the Department of Agriculture. So I say that they cannot do it except in a marginal agricultural situation where people are landed and are growing things.

I am talking about people who are landless.

Mr. GAY: Well, you see, Mr. Krackov, I am asking you in the context of our broad Commission study, and our responsibility is to the entire nation, as to the broad national program.

Mr. KRACKOV: Well, I am not talking to the national problems.

Mr. GAY: But did I understand you correctly that from your standpoint, the USDA should be kept out of it?

Mr. KRACKOV: Yes, that is correct.

Mr. GAY: From your standpoint, the USDA should be kept out of the overall rural poverty program, is that what you were saying?

Mr. KRACKOV: Well, frankly, sir, I am not that expert on the remediacy of their programs in other areas. I have no knowledge in other areas.

But I do know and I do feel that they have not made any dent in the problems of the seasonal farmworkers, and this is what I am a partisan for, and this is what I am generally talking about.

I cannot talk with any expertise about their experiences and their efficacy in other areas.

Mr. GAY: One other question. You were talking about—I do not remember what section—but you were talking about testimony at certain hearings in California, I believe, and I think that was along about the section where you were talking about bricks and mortar.

You made the statement that certain loans and loan guarantees had never been operative to any extent. To what do you refer?

Mr. KRACKOV: I refer to my testimony to the sad, sad report—the Economic Opportunity report. I do not refer to the bill itself where the Senate report, the conference report, suggested these loans.

(Pause).

You are talking about loans and loan guarantees?

Mr. GAY: That is correct.

Mr. KRACKOV: Oh, that was the Economic Opportunity Act Section III-11.

Mr. GAY: And that was never operative in your region?

Mr. KRACKOV: They were never operative throughout the country, sir.

Mr. GAY: Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: I will recognize Mr. Gibson.

Mr. GIBSON: I take it from your testimony that the deficiencies of most of the agencies, whether it be Department of Agriculture or some other agency—you are saying there is a lack of outreach and a lack of close contact. Is that correct?

Mr. KRACKOV: Using the term "outreach" would be an unusual term, but it is correct. They are staying in their offices, and they are not getting out to the people.

Mr. GIBSON: So that it is not necessarily that the Department of Agriculture could not play the role that the community action program has provided for them, if corrective action is taken to get closer to the people; or do you believe that another agency would be more proper?

Mr. KRACKOV: Well, in my knowledge of agencies, I would not say that it could not play the role.

Possibly, by the very nature of the fact that we have a large bureaucracy, these large agencies are necessary; and therefore, I would not say that they could not play the role, but maybe it is perhaps self-contradictory for them to play the role.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions? Do you have a question, Mr. Stanley?

Mr. STANLEY: I am interested in the general analogy and the importance that you gave to the latter part of your testimony.

Am I to understand, or are we to understand, rather, that you believe that the Economic Opportunity Act has been an effective tool in combating rural poverty?

Mr. KRACKOV: Is has been in existence a little more than 2 years. I believe it has been an effective tool in that short period of time.

If it had been given an appropriation this year, if it had been given the support, if it had not been dismembered, and—for instance, the Department of Labor took off some of their programs earlier this year, the manpower programs—and if it were adopted in some of the educational programs, the Office of Education, and if it is allowed to form at a local level and reflect local needs and not be earmarked, it will be and it has been an effective program, yes.

I did not mean to make a speech. I should just have answered your question.

Mr. STANLEY: Thank you, sir.

Mr. HENDERSON: I wonder, sir, if you would just give me two answers, answer two questions.

No. 1, if you were to put a priority on this—I know it is difficult to try to establish a schedule of priorities—but, where would you put your emphasis in terms of preventing rural proverty in the San Joaquin Valley?

You have referred to these persons who are landless, and the persons who are landed.

Where would you put your priority, regardless of agencies now, what kind of programs?

Mr. KRACKOV: Well, I have not testified to that aspect. There are other people here who will testify, too.

I have not really touched on the coverage of farmworkers under the National Labor Relations Act, broadening the minimum wage, bringing the farm labor population into line, letting them have the same coverage and the same protection as other industrial workers —in other words, giving them a chance for employment.

What other areas of remediacy— Being a community-action-oriented person, I would say the needs of these others would be up to local communities.

I think the example again, without my using Allensworth, is that it is certainly—well, the community of Allensworth feels that they need water and sewage, they do need water, and to come in with an overlay of compensatory education would be a little ridiculous.

I would say, then, that bringing farm labor—bringing the farm labor population into line with other forms of labor in the sense of employment opportunities and coverage under the National Labor Relations Act, and the minimum wage and unemployment compensation insurance coverage, from a specific substantive point of view; and then, to work with these communities to see what they feel they need. I think these things must be done.

Mr. HENDERSON: In other words, if I understand you correctly, you seek a program of job creation, the increase of minimum incomes. The maintenance and provision for these things would take priority, for example, over the long-range programs of education and training, is that your thought?

Mr. KRACKOV: Yes, sir.

Mr. HENDERSON: Giving these people an opportunity for self-help. If I understand you correctly, you will correlate this with your self-help concept in terms of an answer to this poverty, as an example.

I gather from your statements that you place a great deal of emphasis on self-help, for two reasons, it being a corrective measure and at the same time it creates jobs and gives them self-sufficiency in their own movement.

Would you just give me a quick word of further clarification on the—as you see it—the potential, the realistic potential, for self-help programs, particularly in the area of housing and public works such as water and sewage; would you just pursue this and give me a little more clarifying picture of your views?

Mr. KRACKOV: The realistic potential on what gage, sir?

If the gage is on great economic impact, I will have to admittedly say that we are not going to produce thousands and thousands of low income housing units under self-help. We are not going to produce thousands and thousands of water and sewage systems under a program of self-help.

But we are going to produce this power and unity to get what they want. We are going to create the atmosphere that will give the people the opportunity to use whatever elective franchise by whatever democratic means they can to get what they want. We are not going to substantively solve all of the problems of Appalachia or Tulare County by the self-help method in building houses or in building water and sewage systems; I would say that this is obvious.

Mr. HENDERSON: Thank you, Mr. Krackòv.

Mr. FISCHER: Has the attempt to organize or the organizing of farm labor in California had any effect, do you believe?

Mr. KRACKOV: Definitely, I believe—

You asked if it has had any effect. It certainly has had an effect in giving hope to, particularly, the Mexican-American farm labor in California in that they will be heard.

So it has had an effect; and, in fact, it has an effect in our program in our county in greater participation. We have something like 18 community action groups in our area, small community groups, and they are very active.

Many of them have membership in the National Farm Workers Union Association. Many of them, while they do not have membership, have been encouraged by the possibility of success in the area of employment.

The CHAIRMAN: We are grateful to you, Mr. Krackov. Thank you very much for your testimony, sir.

Mr. KRACKOV: Thank you for letting me testify so long.

The CHAIRMAN: I certainly hope that you can leave behind a record of your testimony here so that we can have it to refer to.

Mr. KRACKOV: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have done that.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you sir, thank you for coming. We are very grateful to you.

I would like to instruct the members of the Commission to please use the microphones which are nearest to you so that the questions you are propounding to the witness can be heard by the people in the audience, by the members of the press, and by our own Commission members.

We are very grateful to the many people who have requested to be heard during these hearings. We would like also to remind you to adhere to our time schedule. We are giving you as much allowable time as possible, which is 15 minutes for your testimony, thus allowing about 15 minutes for questions to be propounded by members of the Commission.

It is essential that we adhere to this particular schedule since we would not like to impose on those people who have been very wonderful and nice enough to come from so many miles away to give us the benefit of their thoughts on the problems that we are inquiring about.

Now the Commission will recognize Tony Orona, a farmworker from Phoenix, Ariz.

Tony, are you present?

Mr. ORONA: Yes, I am.

The CHAIRMAN: We will recognize you now at this time.

Mr. ORONA: First of all, I need an interpreter because I cannot speak very well in English.

The CHAIRMAN: Tony, we will be happy to help you along; however, if you feel that you need an interpreter sitting by you, we certainly will allow that.

Mr. ORONA: Yes, I believe I do.

The CHAIRMAN: You believe that you would feel more comfortable that way?

Mr. ORONA: Yes, I would.

The CHAIRMAN: Can we call on Grace to help us out? She is a member of our staff.

You do live in Phoenix, do you not, Tony?

Mr. ORONA: Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN: Are you married and do you have a family, sir?

Mr. ORONA: Yes, I have a family of six.

The CHAIRMAN: Are you working now, sir?

Mr. ORONA: No, not at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN: You are unemployed at the present time?

Mr. ORONA: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: What kind of work do you do when you are working?

Mr. ORONA: Most of the time, I do farmwork. I am a farmworker.

(Pause.)

Well, I need an interpreter.

The CHAIRMAN: All right, Grace Olivirez, who is a member of our staff, will act as interpreter. She will sit here by you to help you along.

Now, Tony, I am sorry to keep you waiting, but please relax a little bit, and you please go ahead.

STATEMENT OF TONY ORONA

(Presented through an interpreter)

Mr. ORONA: My name is Tony Orona. I am a family man; I have six children and a wife. I have been a farm laborer most of my life.

I belong to an organization known as MOP, which stands for the migrant opportunity program. This is a program designed to help people who are in farm labor work.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, is that in Phoenix, Ariz.?

Mr. ORONA: No, it is Stanfield, Ariz.

The CHAIRMAN: I see, thank you. You may go ahead.

Mr. ORONA: One of the first programs to be instituted by this organization was transportation to the health clinic, which provided a lot of help for the people.

One of the other benefits derived from this organization was the provision of transportation to pick up surplus commodities, which was a great help to most of the people who had absolutely no foodstuffs.

One of the other phases of the program was adult classes. I personally feel that I need the education. One of the last jobs I applied for, I was rejected because I had no high school diploma.

One of the other benefits was the establishment of day care centers. These were of great help, especially to people who are in the field. However, I feel that it needs a lot more organization from those who are directing the day care centers.

The organization has done a lot of good, and I feel that people are happy with this organization and I feel that there is a great need for people in farmwork to advance.

One of the other things that we need is a full-time school; in other words, all day. But, in addition, I feel that we must receive a stipend that we can attend school and get an education. I have felt the need of an education, but because of my job, I have no set hours. There are days that I must work 10 or 12 hours. Consequently, I cannot fit myself to a schedule for school.

I have myself continued to live without an education, although I feel a great need for it.

I feel that most of the male heads of households in the State of Arizona are not being adequately paid for their labor. There are men who are being paid 90 cents an hour. As a result of that, I was forced to move to an urban setting.

At the present, I am trying to adjust to the urban setting. Even so, I cannot earn sufficiently to support myself and my six children and my wife, a total of eight.

But without an education, I am not going to get very far.

Last year we were promised a housing project in Stanfield; however, this project never materialized over something that happened in Washington.

We were also promised the services of a mechanic, but for some reason or other, the lack of organization within the community has been detrimental to the total program; consequently, we find that we are promised one thing one day, and it never materializes on the second day.

We feel the need of better organization within the organizations themselves.

I feel personally the great need for the program—and I am pleased with the program; it has helped me quite a bit to the extent of helping me move from the rural area to an urban setting and helping me find employment.

But again, I feel that until I get an education—and I hope I have made this very clear to you ladies and gentlemen, that education is what I am really concerned about.

I also feel that although I have been helped, there are other families who need the help and are not getting it; and I hope that this will be corrected in the near future.

Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN: Do you have anything else to add, Tony?

Mr. ORONA: No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN: I would remark that Tony does not seem nervous now and he has given us the benefit of his thoughts, and we certainly do appreciate that.

Now do any members of the Commission have any questions of Tony?

Mr. KING: Tony, I would like to have the full name of MOP that you spoke so kindly about.

Mr. ORONA: Migrant opportunity program.

Mr. KING: It is called the migrant opportunity program?

Mr. ORONA: Yes, sir.

Mr. KING: Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: I will recognize Dr. Davis.

Mr. DAVIS: I was interested in whether or not your children have a chance to go to school regularly.

Mr. ORONA: Yes, thanks to the help I have gotten from the migrant opportunity program, my children have never missed school; but I cannot say the same for other children.

Mr. DAVIS: Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: I will recognize Mr. Gay.

Mr. GAY: You spoke of heads of household in your State.

I have two questions. One, were your wages recently in the neighborhood of 90 cents an hour?

Mr. ORONA: Yes, in some sections of Stanfield, which is a large agricultural area, they are still paying as low as 90 cents an hour to farm laborers.

Mr. GAY: Will you amplify just a little on your reason for your present unemployment?

Mr. ORONA: Yes, I am presently unemployed; I am attending school. The only reason I am not employed is because wherever I have applied for work, they have required a high school diploma.

Mr. GAY: Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN: Dr. Henderson, do you have a question?

Mr. HENDERSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Orona, you have placed a great deal of emphasis on education; and this is, of course, very important.

You have mentioned that one of your recommendations would be a program so that more people could pursue education and, presumably, pursue some sort of training, with an appropriate stipend while pursuing it. I wonder, Mr. Orona, if you would suggest the kind of education and training that you feel would meet the needs.

Now maybe prior to your answering that question, you might tell me or suggest to us here some notion of the Stanfield community, its size, so that I can put this question in its proper perspective with respect to the persons you have reference to.

Mr. ORONA: The first part of my answer is that I am only asking for the ability to be able to write and read English and be able to speak English; although I can speak it and read it, I cannot write it at the present time. That is the answer to the first phase of the question.

When I talked about training, I was talking about either mechanical work or construction, carpentry, any of the professions that would also help people in their own uplift. In other words, carpentry would help me to be able to work around the house; and mechanical training would help me keep my own car up to standard. Anything that would benefit us, not only in our livelihood, but helping ourselves.

Stanfield is an agricultural town, so if I receive any training in mechanics or electrical work, there would be no point in returning to Stanfield, because there would be no employment in the area.

I left Stanfield because I felt there were more opportunities in an urban center; but I am beginning to have my doubts about the opportunities in an urban center without an education.

Mr. HENDERSON: So, you feel that the emphasis should be on education, training—literacy and training—combined with manual skills or some type of craftsman skill that would better prepare a person or better prepare the persons in Stanfield for urban life, for those who choose that life as opposed to rural living.

Mr. ORONA: Yes.

Mr. HENDERSON: Just one more quick question. What is the size of Stanfield, the community of Stanfield? Specifically, what is the population?

Mr. ORONA: If there is someone in the audience who knows, it is up to the Chairman to ask them.

Mr. HENDERSON: Well, I just want an answer to the question; it may come from anyone.

FROM THE FLOOR: It is about 300. It is just a small group of houses there, and there are a few business houses. There is one Government rental program there now, housing.

Mr. HENDERSON: Would I be correct in assuming that this is one of the pockets of the so-called poverty where people are sort of trapped?

FROM THE FLOOR: Not in the same sense that other places are, I would not think. Surrounding the community of Stanfield itself are the farm labor camps.

Mr. HENDERSON: Well, I am merely trying to fill out something here which has to do with recommendations regarding the judgment of moving persons from one area to another, and I needed that information. Thank you very much.

Mr. ORONA: Stanfield is the post office for many labor communities, many farm labor camps surrounding Stanfield. They are all identified as Stanfield, as far as the Post Office is concerned.

The CHAIRMAN: I will recognize Dr. Roessel.

Mr. ROESSEL: I would like to ask Mr. Orona a question. What would be your hopes for the future with regard to your children? What would be the kinds of things that you would hope your children might do as they grow up and the kind of education you would like your children to receive?

Mr. ORONA: The best that is possible.

Mr. ROESSEL: Thank you, sir.

The CHAIRMAN: I have a question. I will ask the question in English so that the interpreter may interpret it and so that the Commission may understand it as well as the rest of the people present.

Now, under the migrant opportunity program that you have made reference to, are you getting evening training, or evening schooling under an adult program?

Mr. ORONA: During the day, sir.

The CHAIRMAN: And what kind of training are you getting?

Mr. ORONA: Strictly an adult literacy program.

The CHAIRMAN: Well, where do you go to take this training? Do you go to one of the local schools there, or do they have a separate building for it, or what?

Mr. ORONA: It is a special center established by the migrant opportunity program that is called their school.

The CHAIRMAN: From what hour to what hour do you attend?

Mr. ORONA: From 8:00 to 4:00.

The CHAIRMAN: How many people are there with you; or, how many other people are attending?

Mr. ORONA: There is a total of 13.

The CHAIRMAN: Are they getting any financial help, any stipend?

Mr. ORONA: Yes, we are getting a stipend. We get $38, in addition to $5 for each one of our children.

The CHAIRMAN: Per week?

Mr. ORONA: Per week, yes.

The CHAIRMAN: And you have six children and they are all attending school?

Mr. ORONA: No, not all of them.

The CHAIRMAN: I mean, those who are of school age, they are attending school?

Mr. ORONA: Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, you mentioned something about a problem of full-time school. Are the children going to school full time; that is, the children that are going to school are going full time, is that correct?

Mr. ORONA: I was referring to adult full-time classes.

The CHAIRMAN: Oh, I see. But, the children are going full time?

Mr. ORONA: Yes, the three who are school age are going full time.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

I will recognize Mr. King.

Mr. KING: I apologize for not being very knowledgeable. Where did the funds come from for this, and are they adequate? And I am wondering if that is a program which should be expanded from a dollar standpoint?

Mr. **ORONA**: The money comes from Economic Opportunity Act Title III-B.

The **CHAIRMAN**: Are there any other questions?

Mr. **BONNEN**: What type of jobs have you applied for? You indicated you had applied for some jobs where you were refused because you do not have a high school diploma. What type of jobs were these?

Mr. **ORONA**: I applied for a job as a chauffeur and then as a truck driver because I do not know how to read and I felt that I could not follow instruction on other types of employment. I did apply as a truck driver and as a chauffeur, and I was turned down because of the lack of a high school diploma.

Mr. **BONNEN**: Do you have any notion as to why a diploma was required for truckdriving or for a job as a chauffeur?

Mr. **ORONA**: Because the truck driver wrote and was delivering merchandise and had to write down things and had to sign delivery slips and so on; and I could not write in English.

Mr. **BONNEN**: It was the literacy problem then. Thank you very much.

The **CHAIRMAN**: Do you have to take a test on applying for jobs of this nature?

Mr. **ORONA**: I told them that I did not have a high school diploma, and they said that they would call me; and I realized that that meant no job.

The **CHAIRMAN**: The graphic situation, "Don't call us, we'll call you."

Mr. **STANLEY**: Mr. Chairman, I have just a couple of quick questions.

The **CHAIRMAN**: All right, go right ahead.

Mr. **STANLEY**: First, when you are not working or going to school and getting a stipend as you are now, are you covered by unemployment insurance?

Mr. **ORONA**: I ran head on into that problem. I went to apply for unemployment, and I have always been a farmworker and farmworkers are not covered by unemployment insurance. I found out that all I had accumulated were zeros.

Mr. **STANLEY**: How do you keep your family during these periods of unemployment?

Mr. **ORONA**: This is one of the reasons why the migrant opportunity program enrolled me in school so that I could get a stipend and support my family.

But I do not consider myself a full-fledged student in that as soon as they are able to find me employment, they will yank me out of classes and give me the employment.

But, this a measure taken by the migrant opportunity program to keep us alive.

Mr. **STANLEY**: Just an academic question. Are you covered by the State minimum wage law?

Mr. **ORONA**: No, there is no State minimum wage law, so far as I know.

The **CHAIRMAN**: Dr. Davis?

Mr. **LAWRENCE DAVIS**: I would just like to know if you feel that there are many people who suffer the same plight that you do?

Mr. **ORONA**: There is quite a number of people that I know of.

The **CHAIRMAN**: Did you have another question, Dr. Henderson?

Mr. HENDERSON: The previous speaker, Mr. Krackov, indicated that it was the impact of the community action programs, the rural community programs, that have given some hope to the kind of situations described. Your migrant opportunity program comes under that.

Could you just give us a quick statement on your views—on your fears and attitudes towards the program under the MOP? I want a comparison of the situation prior to MOP and since the MOP. Can you give us your attitude?

Mr. ORONA: Prior to the migrant opportunity program, everything was in a state of disorganization. We had no transportation to pick up our commodities. For example, we would have to drive into Coolidge or Florence, which is a distance from Stanfield.

We had no transportation to the health clinics, so we had none of the benefits that we have as a result of the migrant opportunity program.

Mr. HENDERSON: Thank you.

Mrs. JACKSON: I have a question.

The CHAIRMAN: All right, Dr. Jackson.

Mrs. JACKSON: Earlier, in answer to the question asked about what you wished for your children, you answered that you wished the best. I would like to know, are you satisfied with what they are getting in school now; and, the other thing, what about their motivation? Do they wish for themselves the best; and are they advancing in school?

Mr. ORONA: Well, I cannot remember what grades, these are numbers, and I am not very good with numbers.

The oldest one is in the sixth grade and is doing quite well. The other children are also doing well. But I cannot quote anything on it right now.

There are no problems with the children in school.

Mrs. JACKSON: Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions? (No response.)

We want to thank you for coming over. I know that you have learned a lot from the little schooling that you already have because you are already answering or nodding immediately after a question is asked of you.

We wish you the best and we certainly appreciate your coming over and giving us the benefit of your testimony. I would add that we have certainly learned a lot from you.

Now, Grace, can we have a copy of his testimony and then have it translated and made of record?

Mr. ORONA: Yes, and thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Orona, and thank you, Grace, for your help.

Mr. ORONA: Thank you. It was a privilege to be here.

The CHAIRMAN: We will move along now. We have had a cancellation of one of our witnesses, but we will probably hear from one that will take his place later on.

We shall move along now. The Commission will recognize Mrs. Leford Harry, who will be accompanied by Mr. Dean Wolfe. Will you please come forward now at this time, Mrs. Harry? Mrs. Harry is from Marana, Ariz.

Mrs. Harry, I know this is an imposing array of people, but you need not be afraid of them. We just look mean, but we really aren't.

We certainly would like to hear from you, and you may proceed at a rate that is best suited to you. We do want to hear from you, so you just go right ahead.

STATEMENT OF MRS. LEFORD HARRY

Mrs. HARRY: Well, I really don't have too much to say.

My name is Mrs. Harry, and I am from Marana, Ariz. We operate under the migrant opportunity program.

I am currently staying in Marana.

Some of the organizations that are working under the MOP are the day care center. We have approximately 100 children a day; or, more definitely, 70 children a day. The older children are the ages of four and five, and they try to teach them the things that will prepare them for school, you know. They try to teach them so they will not be strangers when they go to school. They serve them three meals a day. The children take naps at 12:00 o'clock. They stay from 8:00 to 4:00, every day, 5 days a week.

Some of the other organizations are the adult educational program, which consists of the GED, which is the, well, it is the equivalency of high school; it gives you the opportunity to get the equivalency of a high school diploma.

They have classes three nights a week. They have qualified teachers from Tucson. They try to teach the students, to prepare the students for the test. Last week, the test was given under the MOP. There were 18 students who started to take the test; 11 of us finished. There were five tests consisting of math, science, literature, social studies, and English. Eleven of us finished, and two passed; and fortunately, I was one of the two that passed.

The CHAIRMAN: We are very happy for you, Mrs. Harry.

Mrs. HARRY: Thank you, sir. Now, since the tests have been given, the teachers are working harder on the students that are still going, trying to prepare them mostly on what the tests are about.

Then we have the housing project which just started last Sunday. They had a ground-breaking ceremony. There are foundations. I think it is 12 families that are benefiting from this housing project. They had their land already and they had foundations to build.

What it consists of, the families work together building their own homes. Each family helps the other to build their own homes.

This community includes Rillito, too, because it is 5 miles from Marana.

Rillito has been fighting for water. They don't have water, and they have to travel about 1 mile to haul water back and forth to their houses. They have barrels and things that they keep their water in outside, which is not too sanitary. They haven't any sanitary restrooms inside; they have to go outside.

The bill has been passed, at least I think it has, for Rillito to have wells so that Rillito can get water; but for the past 20 to 25 years they have not had any water.

The CHAIRMAN: May I interrupt you at this time. Where is Marana?

Mrs. **Harry**: Marana is approximately 28 miles from Tucson.

The **Chairman**: Is that going south or north or what?

Mrs. **Harry**: It is going toward Phoenix, which would be mostly north and west.

The **Chairman**: Could you give us the population more or less of the community?

Mrs. **Harry**: Of Marana?

The **Chairman**: Yes, please.

(Pause.)

Perhaps Mr. Wolfe would know the population.

Mr. **Wolfe**: There is about 100 in the immediate town. But in the surrounding area there is about 500 to about 550 square miles, and I would suppose there are about 8,000 people.

The **Chairman**: So it is a small community then?

Mrs. **Harry**: Yes, sir.

The **Chairman**: Then, you have a big school district to service all of the surrounding communities, is that it?

Mr. **Wolfe**: Yes, and as in Stanfield, the surrounding area is mostly farms and the population is primarily migrant farmworkers.

The **Chairman**: I see; it is a farm community?

Mr. **Wolfe**: Yes, sir.

The **Chairman**: When we speak of migrants here, is that considered to be within the State; or do they actually go interstate?

Mr. **Wolfe**: In our case, it is almost within the area.

The **Chairman**: Within the area?

Mr. **Wolfe**: Yes, within the small surrounding area of the town.

The **Chairman**: What type of farming or what kind of crops are in this area?

Mr. **Wolfe**: Cotton and maize.

The **Chairman**: Cotton and maize?

Mr. **Wolfe**: Yes.

The **Chairman**: Now, the other little community that Mrs. Harry mentioned was what?

Mr. **Wolfe**: That is Rillito, spelled R-i-l-l-i-t-o.

The **Chairman**: I see, and that is nearby Marana and is still within the same school district and in the immediate vicinity, is that correct?

Mr. **Wolfe**: Yes, there are 60 families there, hauling their water.

The **Chairman**: I see. Now the migrant opportunity program is being administered out of what community?

Mr. **Wolfe**: Out of Marana.

The **Chairman**: You have a community action program staff there, do you not?

Mr. **Wolfe**: Yes, sir.

The **Chairman**: Now, as to the problem on the water which Mrs. Harry mentioned. Is that also being implemented by the—or under the program here, under the migrant opportunity program?

Mr. **Wolfe**: Not exactly. It came as a result of the community action program which came through MOP.

But it was the efforts of the people of Rillito themselves that got it, and they are working with the Farmers Home Administration for the loan. There were all sorts of legal complications and it has taken 2 years to figure them out; but we are hopeful now.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Wolfe.

Now, Mrs. Harry, you are married and you have a family?

Mrs. HARRY: Yes, I am married.

The CHAIRMAN: And how many children do you have?

Mrs. HARRY: I have four children.

The CHAIRMAN: Are they of school age now?

Mrs. HARRY: One is; and I have two in day care.

The CHAIRMAN: What type of work does your husband do?

Mrs. HARRY: He is a farm laborer.

The CHAIRMAN: Do you go out and work also on the farm; or do you stay home and take care of the children?

Mrs. HARRY: I take care of the children.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Are there any questions on the part of the members of the Commission?

Mr. GAY: We heard earlier from Mr. Krackov on the matter of self-help and his suggestion as to a program of self-help. I am very interested in that.

In your case, you spoke of 12 families getting together for self-housing. Now, whose land are they building on; and if it is their own, how did they acquire the land?

Mrs. HARRY: Well, it is their own land, but how they acquired it I couldn't tell you.

Mr. WOLFE: This came from the former owner. There were about 60 families originally that applied for self-help housing, this being done through the Farmers Home Administration and through the migrant opportunity program. These 12 families were the first to qualify.

They did purchase the land and they are building on this. The amount of the purchase is included in the amount of loan for the material for the housing, and this is made as one lump sum and is being borrowed through the Farmers Home Administration. The loans have been approved and construction has started.

The CHAIRMAN: This was under the Department of Agriculture, too?

Mr. WOLFE: The loan comes from the Department—through the Department.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Mr. GAY: Now, in the statement that Mrs. Harry made, she said that they have not had water, that it has been about 20 or 25 years.

Does she mean to say that they originally had water, but for the past 20 or 25 years they had no water? In other words, has the water been cut off just for the past 20 or 25 years?

Mr. WOLFE: There never was any water there.

Mr. GAY: There never was water?

Mr. WOLFE: No.

The CHAIRMAN: Any other questions?

Mr. KING: Yes, I have a couple of questions.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. King, you are recognized.

Mr. KING: I asked the first witness regarding the Farmers Home Administration, and he never did answer I do not believe. Now I would like to ask the same question of this witness because I have had some experience and interest.

You mentioned the help; and I would like to ask the same question: Would a more liberal interpretation in the Farmers Home

Administration structure be helpful to the problems that you people have discussed here?

Mr. WOLFE: My answer to that would be yes, definitely. From our experience, we have had the very best of relations with the Farmers Home Administration for both the water program and the self-help housing program.

Mr. KING: Are there other programs in this part of the country, other than the water program? I am somewhat familiar with the water program.

Is your community unique, or are there other communities who have need of water systems?

Mr. WOLFE: There are others that should have water. But to my knowledge, they have not gotten assistance yet.

Mr. KING: They have not?

Mr. WOLFE: No, not as of this time.

Mr. KING: Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: All right, I will recognize Mr. Gibson.

Mr. GIBSON: I am interested in finding out Mrs. Harry, what you think—what kinds of services were available to you in your community before MOP?

Were there any agencies which were at work doing any kinds of things that you mentioned, such as day care, adult education? Were there any people to whom you could turn for a self-help housing project or for getting a water system, that you know of?

Mrs. HARRY: Not to the best of my knowledge, no.

Mr GIBSON: Could I ask, Mr. Wolfe, you are with the MOP program?

Mr. WOLFE: Yes.

Mr. GIBSON: I would like to ask you what you think has made the difference, so to speak, and how the Farmers Home Administration is dealing with these problems.

Certainly, MOP has played a role in this. Now, obviously, MOP has established a connection with the Farmers Home Administration and helped to make these things possible.

Now I would like to ask what would happen, or what would be needed, in order to see that this kind of service is sustained if MOP were not there?

Mr. WOLFE: In the Marana-Rillito area, the Migrant Ministry worked for many years. This was a volunteer organization, and it worked for many years teaching basic English and providing some education in the area of cooking, health, and so forth. This was available and was used by many of the people.

As you know, any volunteer program that comes up is problematical.

The migrant opportunity program was a very natural followup to this program, and built on what had already been established. In the Marana-Rillito area, it did have an organization which was only about 2 months old when the MOP program came in. They were organized, and this was the natural followup then to sit down and work out exactly what the migrant opportunity program would do in the Marana-Rillito area.

Among other things, they have been providing free school lunches for all of the school children who have need. About 750 of the 1,400 students enrolled in school are from this poverty group.

Originally, we had this clothing store that we ran where they got used clothing from Tucson and other areas; it was donated, and this helped somewhat. So they had a background, and they had a natural relationship for MOP to come in and they built on this.

If the migrant opportunity program were to end tomorrow, the majority of these programs would go on, I think.

The housing is not a grant, really, although it was helped along by MOP. The same might be true of the water program.

The day care would remain the same. I am sure it would go on since it has reached its present point.

The adult education, I expect, would continue, since the teachers are interested enough to follow up on this and certainly the people are. I believe they would continue, and the education would continue to be given to those who wanted it.

Now, we have had the medical clinic for years, and it is community owned and operated. They are currently treating about 3,500 patients a year, and I am sure it would go on.

I think the community action program under the Community Action Council is strong enough now that they will continue on with their programs and projects of helping each other.

Mr. GIBSON: Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Fischer, did you have a question?

Mr. FISCHER: Does the State of Arizona, through any type of welfare program, help at all?

Mr. WOLFE: According to Arizona law, you have to be a resident 5 years before you can qualify for welfare, and for the true migrant, this is virtually unobtainable.

Mr. FISCHER: Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Davis, I believe has a question.

Mr. NEIL DAVIS: I want to ask or to find out something with which to make up a compilation in this 500-odd square miles of area. Are these principally Negro Americans engaged in cotton farming; or does it include Mexican Americans, Anglo-Americans, Indian Americans? And is there a type of farming which is indicative of the type of population?

Mr. WOLFE: Well, I suppose so, but we have the Silver Bell Mine, which is company owned. About 300 families are there, which are mostly Anglo-American.

Now among the ranchers, the ranch employees, coming primarily from the outskirts of Tucson, they are mostly Anglo-American.

In the ranching area, there are about 20 families which are primarily Mexican American and Indian American.

Actually, the greatest majority of all of these people in this area would be Indian Mexican and Negro, and there are about 250 families which would total about 1,200 people.

Mr. NEIL DAVIS: Well, one other question. In your attempts to work out these community action programs, wherein it requires the cooperation of the entire area, are you able to get these various types of people to act in concert? Do they work together? Or do the Mexican Americans go their way, the Indian Americans go their way, and the Negro Americans go their own way?

Mr. WOLFE: No, we have had no problem at all. Everyone works together very well.

Mr. NEIL DAVIS: Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: I will recognize Dr. Roessel.

Mr. ROESSEL: I would like to ask several questions. Are all of the needs of the area, in terms of coverage—in other words, are there individuals who are not able to take part in the program because of mitigating circumstances in terms of facilities or personnel or something like this? In other words, does it meet the needs of everyone?

Mr. WOLFE: Transportation is a very large problem. Some of them live as much as 35 miles out, and this has become a very definite problem.

Mr. ROESSEL: My second question goes to Indians as a group that reside in this area. Would you tell me something of the kinds of involvement they have participated in with regard to this program? What is the type of participation and what is the type of service? I assume the part I would particularly be interested in would be as to the participation of the people.

Mr. WOLFE: They have two basic Indian groups. One is the Yaqui Indians from New Mexico; and the other is the Papago Indians, who are native to Arizona.

So we have two different sets of problems with the two groups of Indians. But they are working in our day care and attend the adult education classes. They have been officers in the migrant opportunity program. They participate quite fully in the overall program and in the Council. In fact, one of our leaders for the migrant opportunity program for the Rillito area is here and is a Papago Indian. So they do participate to a great extent.

Mr. ROESSEL: Just one final question with regard to the Indian participation and the problems connected therewith. What is the organization of your administrative board?

I assume there is, in the community action program, some group that is responsible for the advances made, and there has been some discussion with regard to the representation of the various groups on the board. Would you tell us what the composition of your board is?

Mr. WOLFE: Well, we have two, obviously, in the migrant opportunity program, such as the Marana-Rillito area. This is the way it is handled in Arizona.

They have two delegates from each of the 10 communities, and these delegates are from the CORE group. Their interest, of course, is on the State level, meeting with the directors of the program and the Arizona Council of Churches, which is the sponsoring agency.

Locally, the Migrant Opportunity Council has its officers, which are elected by the total group. They have no say at all as to the finances. That comes from the State level.

Mr. ROESSEL: Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: I will recognize Mr. Davis.

Mr. NFIL DAVIS: I would like to ask Mrs. Harry a question. How long were you in school before you dropped out?

Mrs. HARRY: I completed the 11th grade.

The CHAIRMAN: How long ago was this, Mrs. Harry?

Mrs. HARRY: Ten years ago.

Mr. NEIL DAVIS: What is the average?

Mr. WOLFE: The average for our area, I might add, is three years of education.

The **CHAIRMAN**: Dr. Henderson?

Mr. **HENDERSON**: Mrs. Harry. I must say that your presentation is very interesting.

Now, your husband is a migrant worker; but his farm labor is in this area, is that correct?

Mrs. **HARRY**: Yes, sir.

Mr. **HENDERSON**: How much education has he had?

Mrs. **HARRY**: He completed the 10th grade.

Mr. **HENDERSON**: Does he enjoy year-round full-time employment; or what type of unemployment does he experience?

Mrs. **HARRY**: Well, he doesn't exactly experience any unemployment. He doesn't have a steady year-round job either. He works seasonally. You see, from the growing of the cotton—he helps plant the cotton, he plows the land, and then he helps pick cotton; and then, when the cotton is picked, they have to take it to the gin. Well, then he works in the gin approximately 4 months out of the year. But when he is not working in the gin, he is either working for the company that sprays the cotton, or he is working on a farm doing plowing and planting.

Mr. **HENDERSON**: So really, during the course of a year, he literally finds himself employed on three different kinds of jobs. Is that right, Mrs. Harry?

Mrs. **HARRY**: Yes.

Mr. **HENDERSON**: Even though they are related to cotton.

Mrs. **HARRY**: Yes.

Mr. **HENDERSON**: Now when your husband plows and plants cotton, does he work for the particular, one particular farmer; or does he work for several farmers?

Mrs. **HARRY**: He works for several.

Mr. **HENDERSON**: Does he know, for example, from one year or from one season to the next what farmer is going to employ him?

Mrs. **HARRY**: No, he doesn't.

Mr. **HENDERSON**: This is left to chance; it is problematical?

Mrs. **HARRY**: Yes.

Mr. **HENDERSON**: Now let me ask one further question. You have now completed your high school education. You have qualified for the high school diploma, if I understand correctly.

Mrs. **HARRY**: Yes.

Mr. **HENDERSON**: Why did you desire to do this? You do not work, you are a housewife with four children. What motivated you to want to pursue this education?

Mrs. **HARRY**: Well, before I got the diploma, I tried to get jobs and all the jobs I tried to get required a high school diploma. With a diploma, I will either try to find a job, or try to go to college.

I think that by going to college I will be better able to help my children.

Mr. **HENDERSON**: May I ask you, if you do not mind, what is your age?

Mrs. **HARRY**: My age?

Mr. **HENDERSON**: Well, do not tell me if you do not want to.

Mrs. **HARRY**: Well, I am 26.

Mr. **HENDERSON**: One other question. Your intention, as I gather it, would be to stay in Marana, in the Marana community, or do you have any intention of leaving the community?

Mrs. **HARRY**: At the present time, I have no intention to leave.

Mr. HENDERSON: Is that because you were born and raised there? Well, perhaps, I better ask you where you come from?

Mrs. HARRY: I came from Kansas City, Mo.

Mr. HENDERSON: And what about your husband?

Mrs. HARRY: He was born in the State of Arizona.

Mr. HENDERSON: The reason for these questions I am asking—one of the problems that we do have in terms of understanding the problems and having a basis for recommendation is that we have the generational aspect of the problem, and we want to know how far it is carried forward. This is why I was pursuing the question as I was doing.

I would gather then that your husband does not contemplate returning to school. Is this a fair assumption?

Mrs. HARRY: No, he does not.

Mr. HENDERSON: Mr. Wolfe, let me ask one last question of you. There were 18 persons who took the GED tests. For how long a period of time had they been pursuing this course?

Mr. WOLFE: Some had not at all.

Mr. HENDERSON: Are these people now pursuing the course?

Mr. WOLFE: Originally, we wanted them to do this, to take the tests and find out their area of need and study.

At that time, the tests were not available. We did make arrangements through the migrant opportunity program to have the tests given; and, of course, if you have not been to school for 10 or 15 years, any time you run up against a test, this is quite an emotional experience in itself.

Mr. HENDERSON: Are those who took the course that was alluded to earlier—how many of those actually passed the tests? I know there were two persons who passed it, but how many were actually involved in taking the course?

Mr. WOLFE: Well, it varies; but, 14 or 15 usually. Now, she said they did not pass the tests.

Now, there are five separate sections. If a person fails one section, then this one section is what they have to take over, not the entire series of tests, just the one section. Now, with 2 weeks' brush-up, a person could probably take it and pass and also get his GED diploma.

So it is not as tragic as it sounds. In the majority of these—well, you do have to wait 30 days to take it again—but, in the majority, I am sure the majority of the others will take it and pass it.

Mr. HENDERSON: Now, your day care center program—does this take on any of the characteristics of Operation Headstart; or is this strictly a baby-sitting type of operation?

Mr. WOLFE: Well, you have a qualified, a registered kindergarten teacher, and for all intents and purposes, this teacher teaches this kindergarten class.

Mr. HENDERSON: But the community has no interest or they have made no attempt in the area of Headstart?

Mr. WOLFE: They have had Headstart for the past 2 years; and, prior to that, for 3 years, the migrant opportunity program had its adult education program.

Mr. HENDERSON: Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Do you have a question, Dr. Jackson?

Mrs. JACKSON: Yes, I have some difficulty comprehending the school district, the situation in this area today. I don't know about public schools where Mrs. Harry has her children enrolled.

Where have your children been going to school; that is, have they been going within the immediate community? Are they going within the immediate community now, and are they transported? When they leave high school—thereafter, what will happen in this area?

Mrs. HARRY: Well, the school district is in Marana, and they are transported by school buses. They have buses go into the different areas to get the children in the mornings, and then they take the kids back to school and then bring them home. The elementary school and the high school are both there together.

Mrs. JACKSON: Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: We certainly want to thank you, Mrs. Harry, and you too, Mr. Wolfe, for a very interesting discussion. The members of the Commission certainly have indicated an interest in what you are doing in your community.

Now I am sorry, Mrs. Harry, about your husband not passing along with you, but I certainly am happy for you.

Thank you again, Mrs. Harry, and thank you very much, Mr. Wolfe.

Mrs. HARRY: Thank you.

Mr. WOLFE: It is our pleasure.

The CHAIRMAN: The members of the Commission will recognize now the farmworker from Marana, Ariz., Mr. Leonard Miguel.

Are you present, Mr. Miguel?

Mr. MIGUEL: Yes, and I come from Marana, Ariz.

The CHAIRMAN: All right, please come forward and the Commission will be happy to hear from you, sir.

STATEMENT OF LEONARD MIGUEL

The CHAIRMAN: Now, Mr. Miguel, you are from Marana, Ariz., is that correct?

Mr. MIGUEL: Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN: And are you married, sir?

Mr. MIGUEL: Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN: And you have a family?

Mr. MIGUEL: Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN: Are you presently engaged in any type of work?

Mr. MIGUEL: I beg your pardon?

The CHAIRMAN: Are you working now?

Mr. MIGUEL: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: What kind of work do you do when you work?

Mr. MIGUEL: Well, right now, I am doing upholstery work.

The CHAIRMAN: How did you take this up? How did you come about doing the work that you are doing now? Were you trained for it, or did you just learn it by yourself?

Mr. MIGUEL: Well, I learned it through the migrant opportunity program.

The CHAIRMAN: You learned this through the migrant opportunity program?

Mr. MIGUEL: Yes, they had school at Marana which I took for

4 months. After the 4 months, they sent me over here in town and helped me to get the job.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, Mr. Miguel, please speak right into the microphone so that we can all hear you.

You are not nervous, are you, Mr. Miguel? Just be at ease. We do not want to cut you off. We want to hear everything you want to tell us. I know that all of the members of the Commission are very interested in what you have to say.

Mr. MIGUEL: All right, sir.

The CHAIRMAN: Did you finish high school, for example, Mr. Miguel?

Mr. MIGUEL: No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN: You did not?

Mr. MIGUEL: No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN: How far did you go in school?

Mr. MIGUEL: To the eighth grade; and I didn't graduate.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, did you drop out because you were no longer interested in education, or what was the reason that prompted you to quit school?

Mr. MIGUEL: Well, at the time I was going to school I was playing football, and one evening we were having practice, and I had my spikes on, and, you know, I was supposed to be punting, and I took off my shoes and I kicked the ball and I started running and someone stepped on my foot and made a big hole in it and it caused me to, well, I couldn't walk on it. So I just quit. I thought I would go back, but I got so far behind on my work and everything and I just couldn't catch up. I tried, but I couldn't. So I just quit.

The CHAIRMAN: So, actually, it was as a result of an injury which you received that prompted you to fall behind in your work, is that right?

Mr. MIGUEL: Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN: And then, when you found that you could not catch up, then that is the thing that probably prompted you to quit. Is that what you are telling us?

Mr. MIGUEL: Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN: All right. Now then, what did you depend upon for any particular specialized training prior to taking this training with the migrant opportunity program? Did you have any particular type of work that you were engaged in prior to learning this new trade?

Mr. MIGUEL: Well, at the time, I didn't have no kind of work. The only thing I did know was farm labor.

The CHAIRMAN: Was that working in the cottonfields and farms?

Mr. MIGUEL: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: How old are you now?

Mr. MIGUEL: Twenty.

The CHAIRMAN: You are 20 years old now?

Mr. MIGUEL: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: And how long have you been married?

Mr. MIGUEL: Close to 1 year.

The CHAIRMAN: It was only recently that you got married then?

Mr. MIGUEL: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: When did you take this training under the migrant opportunity program? How long ago?

Mr. MIGUEL: That was in October, October 16.

The CHAIRMAN: Of last year?

Mr. MIGUEL: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: And how long did it last?

Mr. MIGUEL: Four months.

The CHAIRMAN: Were you given any financial assistance while you were learning this trade?

Mr. MIGUEL: To learn the trade?

The CHAIRMAN: Well, were you given any money, for example, while you were going to school?

Mr. MIGUEL: Oh, yes, I was.

The CHAIRMAN: And how much was that?

Mr. MIGUEL: It was $38 for myself, I guess; and $5 for each dependent that I had, which is $43 a week.

The CHAIRMAN: So it was actually only for yourself and for your wife?

Mr. MIGUEL: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Do you live by yourselves; that is, your family? Or are you living with any other member of your family?

Mr. MIGUEL: I was living with my sister then.

The CHAIRMAN: You were living with your sister?

Mr. MIGUEL: Yes, at Marana.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, my next question, if you care to answer it, what type of wages are you getting now?

Mr. MIGUEL: The place where I work?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, what are the wages that you are receiving at the place where you are employed at this time?

Mr. MIGUEL: $1.35 an hour.

The CHAIRMAN: How long have you been working at this job, did you say?

Mr. MIGUEL: I just started working Monday.

The CHAIRMAN: You started this past Monday?

Mr. MIGUEL: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: I am very happy for you.

Mr. MIGUEL: Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Are you satisfied with your employer; and, is that in Marana?

Mr. MIGUEL: No, it is here in Tucson.

The CHAIRMAN: Here in Tucson, Ariz.?

Mr. MIGUEL: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Do you commute back and forth? Do you go back and forth from and to home every day; do you go home at the end of each day?

Mr. MIGUEL: No, because last Friday adult education was over; and I moved here to Tucson where I could be closer to my job.

The CHAIRMAN: Do you have your wife here with you now?

Mr. MIGUEL: Yes, here in town.

The CHAIRMAN: Are you renting?

Mr. MIGUEL: No, I am staying with my mother now. A gentleman who has something to do with the migrant opportunity program, he said he would give me a house, a furnished house, if he could and then we could move in by ourselves.

The CHAIRMAN: Do you think you are going to like the arrangement?

Mr. MIGUEL: Yes, I think so.

The CHAIRMAN: Now is there any particular information which you would like to give the Commission about which I may not have asked you up to this point? (Pause.) Do you want to tell us anything? You just make any statement you care to at this time.

Mr. MIGUEL: Well, I would like to say something about the adult education center.

Personally, I thought it was wonderful. It was a wonderful experience to me to have had a chance to learn and relearn some of the things that I had learned before when I was in junior high school at Marana. I felt it was just wonderful.

The CHAIRMAN: You feel that it has prepared you a little better than you were prepared before?

Mr. MIGUEL: It has.

The CHAIRMAN: Do you feel, for example, that adult education in the evenings, if it were made available to you, would you like to go back to school and prepare yourself for something better?

Mr. MIGUEL: I would, yes.

The CHAIRMAN: You would be interested in such a program?

Mr. MIGUEL: Yes, I would.

The CHAIRMAN: Is there any other information you would like to give us?

Mr. MIGUEL: Not really.

The CHAIRMAN: All right, let me now ask the members of the Commission if they have any questions.

Mr. BONNEN: I have a question, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Go right ahead, Mr. Bonnen.

Mr. BONNEN: Did you grow up in Marana? Is that your home? Were you born there?

Mr. MIGUEL: Well, I was born out on a reservation; but I was raised in Marana.

Mr. BONNEN: I see. At what age did you move to Marana?

Mr. MIGUEL: Oh, I was about six or eight.

Mr. BONNEN: And did your whole family move, is that the situation?

Mr. MIGUEL: I beg your pardon?

Mr. BONNEN: Your entire family moved to Marana?

Mr. MIGUEL: Yes.

Mr. BONNEN: I gather that your mother lives in Tucson now?

Mr. MIGUEL: Yes, she does.

Mr. BONNEN: When did they move to Tucson?

Mr. MIGUEL: Last year.

Mr. BONNEN: I see. Just recently.

Mr. MIGUEL: Yes.

Mr. BONNEN: Is your father alive?

Mr. MIGUEL: No, he passed away in 1960, and I have a stepfather.

Mr. BONNEN: I see, and does he work in Tucson? Why is it that your mother lives in Tucson?

Mr. MIGUEL: Why did she move here?

Mr. BONNEN: Yes.

Mr. MIGUEL: Well, she wanted to have better conditions in living, as good conditions as she could, and of course my stepfather is unable to work. He is disabled.

Mr. BONNEN: Her intention is to stay in Tucson?

Mr. MIGUEL: Yes.

Mr. BONNEN: Does she work here in Tucson?

Mr. MIGUEL: No, she doesn't work.

Mr. BONNEN: How do they support themselves, your stepfather and your mother?

Mr. MIGUEL: From the money that she gets from the welfare.

Mr. BONNEN: They have welfare for their support?

Mr. MIGUEL: Yes.

Mr. BONNEN: Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Any further questions?

Mr. ROESSEL: Yes, I have a few questions. You mentioned the reservation; is this the Papago Reservation?

Mr. MIGUEL: Yes.

Mr. ROESSEL: Did you ever go to school on the Papago Reservation?

Mr. MIGUEL: For a little while, but not too long. I didn't like it out there.

Mr. ROESSEL: Where did you go to school when you were there?

Mr. MIGUEL: On the reservation?

Mr. ROESSEL: Yes.

Mr. MIGUEL: I think they had a little Government school out there that I went to.

Mr. ROESSEL: Where was this?

Mr. MIGUEL: At Claremore, Ariz., (phonetic), at the Papago Station.

Mr. ROESSEL: Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Any other questions?

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask you a question. I gather from the information that has been given here so far that Arizona does not have adult vocational schools. Am I correct in that?

The CHAIRMAN: Is there anyone in the audience who knows the answer to that question?

Mr. ROESSEL: I can answer that. That is correct; your statement is correct. The State of Arizona does not have such schools.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Dr. Roessel.

Mr. JOHNSON: Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you for coming, Mr. Miguel, and for giving us the benefit of your experience; and, of course, the interest that you have shown is the type that we very much like to hear. So thank you again for coming and for being with us.

Mr. MIGUEL: You are welcome. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: The Commission will now recognize Mrs. Vanilla Sanders from Buckeye, Ariz., who is accompanied by Rev. Harold Lundgren.

You may proceed, Mrs. Sanders, to give us your statement.

STATEMENT OF VANILLA SANDERS

I am Vanilla Sanders from Marana, Ariz. My husband and I and our nine children have lived in Arizona for more than 25 years. During that time we have worked as farm laborers. Together we chopped and picked cotton, and picked fruit and vegetables.

For about 20 years we have lived in a farm labor camp near Buckeye, owned by a grower. For a number of years we lived in a one-room cabin; now we live in a four-room house.

At home now there are 11 children. With my husband and myself, there are 13 in our family.

When we were picking cotton together we could, on our best days, make $15 to $20. Sometimes our children would help in picking cotton.

Neither my husband or myself pick cotton by hand now. For some years now, most of the cotton is picked with machines. My husband now drives the machine that picks cotton. For this he receives a dollar an hour. Sometimes he irrigates and receives $10 for 12 hours' work. If it rains or there is no work, he receives no wages.

During the past years, it has not been easy to keep the children in school and some of the other people have been worse off than we were, and there may have been some that would have gone without food if the school or the church had not helped.

About a year ago, Abe Harris came to visit us and told us that the Government was concerned with farmworkers and he asked us if we would like to come to a meeting in Allenville. At the meeting it was explained that a new program in which the people could take part was to begin.

One of the first things that was discussed was having a nursery. So many mothers who worked in the fields had been taking their children with them. We were told that the building for this center would be built by the people in the community, and this building and the day care center would be in the hands of the people. The day care center hired our people to work in it, giving jobs to many women who needed them.

The women who worked in the day care center went to Phoenix College to learn about the care of children. After the training, I was put in charge of the nursery. In the center, children are cared for from 6 a.m. to 6 p.m. The children are given the best of care and also learn many things from the teachers, so they can go to the first grade without any trouble.

Although I don't live in Allenville today, I expect to live there some day; so I was glad to join with the organization of the people and help to bring to the community many good things, such as street lights, a paved street, and stop signs.

I also helped, with others, to secure water for the people. One of Allenville's problems was an open sewer ditch, which was a health hazard. Members of our organization went to the county supervisors and received their promise to cover the ditch.

Just about this time, classes for adults were started with the help of an education director, who was a member of the migrant opportunity program, which was an OEO program.

I started in a sewing class and then I entered a class in basic education, which would help me to get my GED certificate. When I was a girl, I completed the seventh grade. My husband went to the fifth grade. My oldest daughter graduated from high school, and I now have three children in high school.

We now have an educational center in Allenville, which has a library and a playroom and study hall for the children.

VISTA has also come to our community and helped the children in recreation and with their school problems. They also helped the people who were sick or had other needs.

The camp where we now live is being torn down, as are most of the farm labor camps near us. My husband would like to get a better job some day, but he is afraid that if he leaves the one he has, he will not find another one.

When I go to the child development center, I take 14 children in my car. The mothers of these children work in the fields.

I received services from the migrant health clinic, which was on wheels and came to our camp twice a month.

My father and mother were farmers; and when I was a little girl, they came to Arizona from Arkansas. My father had come to Arizona picking cotton and then decided to bring his family. As a little girl, I picked cotton, and when I was 14, I left school to get married.

The Mennonite Church came to our camp and we joined this group, who helped us in many ways. When there was need, they brought food and clothing to the people. They also took people to the hospital and to welfare.

The **CHAIRMAN**: Now, Mrs. Sanders, these programs about which you speak—I believe you have the baby clinic. Is that what you said?

Mrs. **SANDERS**: We have a well baby clinic.

The **CHAIRMAN**: What program does it come under? Was it organized by a private social welfare organization, or who started it up?

Mrs. **SANDERS**: I really don't know.

Mr. **LUNDGREN**: The county health department, the migrant health section of the county health department.

The **CHAIRMAN**: I see. That is not under the migrant opportunity program?

Mr. **LUNDGREN**: No, sir.

The **CHAIRMAN**: Now I believe this transportation was provided that enabled you to see a doctor once every 2 months. Is that your testimony?

Mrs. **SANDERS**: Yes.

The **CHAIRMAN**: Is that under the migrant opportunity program?

Mr. **LUNDGREN**: It is a health department program, and it was every other week, twice a month.

The **CHAIRMAN**: Twice a month, I see.

Are there any other questions by any member of the Commission?

Mr. **GIBSON**: Mrs. Sanders, is there a program for prenatal care also?

Mrs. **SANDERS**: Yes.

Mr. **GIBSON**: How old is this program that provides this? Did you have the advantage of health services when your children were born?

Mrs. **SANDERS**: Yes.

Mr. **GIBSON**: Then it is a program of long standing?

Mrs. **SANDERS**: Yes.

Mr. **GIBSON**: Thank you, I have no more questions.

The **CHAIRMAN**: Mr. Davis?

Mr. **NEIL DAVIS**: Mrs. Sanders, you told us that you and your family lived in a one-room house for a long time. How many children were in this one-room house before you were able to get the four-room house?

Mrs. SANDERS: Well, I have had to live in a one-room house with nine children.

Mr. NEIL DAVIS: There were 11 of you then living in a one-room house?

Mrs. SANDERS: Yes, that's right.

Mr. NEIL DAVIS: Now, you spoke of your intention to move and build a house of your own. Have you been advised that there is a way for you to borrow the money to build a house; and then you can pay this loan off over a long period of time?

Mrs. SANDERS: No, I haven't.

Mr. NEIL DAVIS: Thank you.

The **CHAIRMAN**: I will recognize Dr. Roessel.

Mr. ROESSEL: I would like to ask one question of each of the two individuals.

I believe you said, Mrs. Sanders, that your husband was working on a 24-hour shift, as you called it, and for that period of time, he got $10. Is that correct?

Mrs. SANDERS: Yes, that's correct.

Mr. ROESSEL: Could you describe for the benefit of those of us who may not exactly know what you mean by irrigating, just what this consists of? In other words, what does he do?

Mrs. SANDERS: Well, he irrigates in this area here at certain times. He goes out and he sets up the pipe so that the water will run down the middles, you know, between the rows. He sets up these rows, and they run only so many pipes in a field.

They run these pipes certain lengths of time, and then he has to make sure that these pipes make the water go down the middle and not on all parts of the field.

Then in maybe 12 hours, he changes these. He moves them over into another section of rows.

Mr. ROESSEL: Now, Reverend Lundgren, I would like if you would answer a question for me.

We have heard reference earlier from one of the people who spoke to us about the Migrant Ministry and its role as the earlier organization before the migrant opportunity program came into existence.

Could you tell us a little bit of its work and tell us a little of its results; and, perhaps, of its status today?

Mr. LUNDGREN: The Migrant Ministry administered a program which is actually administered by the Council of Churches, and for 10 years, I directed this program. I thought it was pretty successful myself.

Mr. ROESSEL: I am sure it was, sir.

Mr. LUNDGREN: What we tried to do was to enlist the aid of a great many volunteers. Many of the things that are being done now, such as the day care centers, we handled that with our volunteers. We had volunteers for adult education program also.

We were responsible for starting a mobile health clinic which now the health department has taken over and uses.

I feel that a good deal of the work which was done by the volunteers is work which is done now with very few changes except that it has been built up with Federal funds.

We were able to organize people who were able to create and motivate a kind of desire and hope so that people could be assisted.

It is comparatively easy to come into this kind of program that has already been set up, which had the full cooperation of the people.

The leadership for this program was developed over the years, and now the migrant opportunity program has taken it over and it is very successful.

Mr. ROESSEL: One final question. In terms of the future of MOP, I guess it is planned year by year from the Office of Economic Opportunity. And my question is, what is its status and when does it expire; and what are its prospects for the future?

Mr. LUNDGREN: We are right now waiting for final word from Washington on the phase of our program which has to do with day care and education. I think within the next couple of weeks, we will get word, and that will continue for 1 year.

Another phase of our program will end as of the end June, and we hope it will be re-funded for another year. That is the way it works.

We have approximately $1,400,000 to carry on our programs in 10 different communities; and we are talking about day care, day care centers; and we are talking about maybe a couple of thousand children; and we are talking about educational programs and community action programs, also.

Mr. ROESSEL: Maybe I should ask one more question. You indicate that in the State of Arizona, there is this program that is for 10 communities. Are there other communities which have equal problems but which do not have equal assistance?

Mr. LUNDGREN: Yes.

Mr. ROESSEL: Or is this taking care of all of the needs in Arizona?

Mr. LUNDGREN: No, it really isn't. There are other communities. For instance, Yuma County. We have not done anything in Yuma County.

We are still struggling with the problem of these very isolated camps that are way out from some of these centers where we are now operating.

Mr. ROESSEL: Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Any other questions? I will recognize Mr. Bonnen.

Mr. BONNEN: Reverend, perhaps you can clarify something for me.

I get the impression that what was once migratory camps are now becoming seasonal labor camps with relatively permanent residents. Is that correct?

Mr. LUNDGREN: Yes, correct.

Mr. BONNEN: Now what is causing this?

Mr. LUNDGREN: Well, I think that the people themselves are anxious to have a chance to settle down. It seems like it isn't—well, they are becoming aware of the fact that the mobility itself is a bad thing. I have talked to many families who say that they want to stay here because they want their children to be able to go to school. It is difficult when they move around.

Mr. BONNEN: I get the impression that the Migrant Ministry, as the forerunner, was the innovator of most of the programs that we now have, the ones that are being funded through the OEO, for example, and they are simply extensions of things that the Migrant Ministry was doing with the migratory labor previously. Is that correct?

Mr. LUNDGREN: That is true.

Mr. BONNEN: Are there many exceptions to this? Are there programs which have been created which did not have forerunners in the area of the experience of the Migrant Ministry before?

Mr. LUNDGREN: Well, in our State, I think—well, primarily, I suppose because I was a part of the Migrant Ministry program, and then I became the director of this program, and I suppose that in our State, this was done.

Of course, the self-help housing, for instance, was not originally—it was an innovation; and then, we have been able to expand this training program much more because we have been able to put people in classes during the days even and give them stipends so that they could go to school, and many new things and better things have come, of course, because of the poverty program.

Mr. BONNEN: Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Anything further? Dr. Henderson, do you have a question?

Mr. HENDERSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mrs. Sanders, I would like to raise this question. You mentioned the fact of your husband moving from the picking stage to the stage of driving a machine.

From your observation, what has been the impact of mechanization and the introduction of machines with regard to job opportunities for the persons who reside in Buckeye, Ariz., for example?

Mrs. SANDERS: I don't understand.

Mr. HENDERSON: Well, perhaps it is a hard question to answer. There is a problem, in other words, with the machines coming in and taking jobs from the workers at Buckeye. Is that correct?

Mrs. SANDERS: Well, no. My husband is steadily employed. He has a year-round job.

Mr. HENDERSON: Is this true of most of the male heads of household in this area?

Mrs. SANDERS: No.

Mr. HENDERSON: Do you lose any persons from Buckeye? What has been the difference in the people that you have known for several years, for many years? Have they stayed there, or do they move to other towns and do not come back?

Mrs. SANDERS: No, new peoples are not coming in now like they used to.

Mr. HENDERSON: In other words, the problems that you have faced in Buckeye, Ariz.—

Well, let me ask another question before I go into that. What about the children? Do they stay also?

Mrs. SANDERS: Yes, most of them do.

Mr. HENDERSON: So, in other words, the problems we are dealing with here, in your judgment, they would have to be solved in relation to Buckeye, Ariz.; and we could not think in terms of solving these problems by these people moving to other places in the country? It looks like, in your judgment, that this is going to be a relatively stable kind of residential area?

Mrs. SANDERS: Yes.

Mr. HENDERSON: Are you with me?

Mrs. SANDERS: Yes, I think so.

Mr. HENDERSON: Would this be a fair conclusion to come to?

Mrs. SANDERS: Well, I really don't know.

Mr. HENDERSON: I understand. Rev. Lundgren, would you like to comment on this?

Mr. LUNDGREN: Of course, the coming of the cotton-picking machines in the last 10 years has changed things.

Mr. HENDERSON: This has been in the last ten years?

Mr. LUNDGREN: Yes, and it has changed the picking of the cotton. When I first came, 10 percent of the cotton was picked by machines; and now, 98 percent is picked by machines. So, obviously, hundreds of people are not able to pick cotton.

Of course, it was that the husband and wife and the children used to go out in the field and pick cotton; and this is no longer possible.

Mr. HENDERSON: I see.

Mr. LUNDGREN: So, you see, this has made a real change.

Mr. HENDERSON: What have been the consequences of that? Are there people that are unemployed with nothing to do that are moving to other parts of the country?

Mr. LUNDGREN: Well, you see, we have a movement of seasonal farmworkers from, let us say, Texas on up through Arizona. They would come in in September and they would stay perhaps up until January. This was in groups, you see. They would come to camps like Rillito.

But now these no longer come to any large degree. So that what you have is the people who have decided to settle down, and I feel they are going to continue to stay there.

Mr. HENDERSON: Did I understand you correctly, Mrs. Sanders, that your housing and where you would like to live is in Allenville. Is that correct?

Mrs. SANDERS: Yes.

Mr. HENDERSON: All right, thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: All right, are there any further questions? Go ahead, Dr. Jackson.

Mrs. JACKSON: Mrs. Sanders, do you have teenage children?

Mrs. SANDERS: Yes, I have three teenagers in high school, and I have one daughter who is grown up and already married.

Mrs. JACKSON: Do you mind discussing just a little bit what they do when they are not in school?

Mrs. SANDERS: Well, I have one girl that works in Headstart. She has in the past year, when she was not in school.

And the boys go out in the fields to chop cotton. Sometimes the boys go out in the field with their father to chop cotton.

Mrs. JACKSON: What do they do for recreation?

Mrs. SANDERS: They go to the recreation center in Allenville. They have a boys club and a girls club and things like that.

Mrs. JACKSON: Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it my understanding that you do have the Headstart program under the MOP?

Mrs. SANDERS: I am not sure just exactly what it is.

Mr. LUNDGREN: It is under the school.

The CHAIRMAN: I see.

Mr. LUNDGREN: But we have within the day care center for the

4- and 5-year-olds a program that is very similar to one that was already in operation before MOP.

The **CHAIRMAN**: I see. But this has been more or less a part of the educational system of the State of Arizona? The State takes over?

Mr. **LUNDGREN**: It is a program of the school board.

The **CHAIRMAN**: I see. It is administered by the school board, in other words?

Mr. **LUNDGREN**: Yes.

The **CHAIRMAN**: Now, under the MOP program, do you have any evening adult classes?

Mrs. **SANDERS**: Yes.

The **CHAIRMAN**: Now, this gives some of the citizens there in your community, for example, the opportunity to take up their schooling, if they are dropouts?

Mrs. **SANDERS**: Yes.

The **CHAIRMAN**: It gives them the opportunity for further schooling?

Mrs. **SANDERS**: Yes.

The **CHAIRMAN**: All right, I see. Are there any further questions? (No response.)

We certainly want to thank you, Mrs. Sanders, for coming over and giving us the benefit of your testimony.

Of course, we want to thank the Reverend very much for his help.

We are going to work right through the lunch hour. We want the people who plan to be testifying to stand by because we will work to the lunch hour. Some of us will go to lunch, just a few of us at a time, so that a majority of the members will be present at all times while the witnesses are presenting their statements and testimony.

Now, is there a question from the floor?

FROM THE FLOOR: Mr. Chairman, would you please have the Commission identify themselves so that we will know who they are at all times?

The **CHAIRMAN**: I think that was done at the beginning; but we will be most happy to go ahead and see that they identify themselves now. Perhaps we should accord each one an opportunity to do so at this time. We will start with Dr. Roessel, and will you please identify yourself with the microphone so that the people present can hear you?

Mr. **ROESSEL**: I am Bob Roessel. I work at the Rough Rock Demonstration School on the Navajo Reservation in Arizona.

Mr. **BONNEN**: My name is James Bonnen, and I am on the faculty at Michigan State University.

Dr. **LAWRENCE DAVIS**: I am Lawrence Davis and I am President of Arkansas Agricultural, Mechanical and Normal College, which is a land grant institution. I am a native of a town of about 1,200 people, and I used to pick cotton and do other farmwork.

Mr. **NEIL DAVIS**: I am editor and publisher of a newspaper in Alabama.

Mr. **FISCHER**: I am John Fischer, editor of Harper's Magazine.

Mr. **GAY**: I am Connie Gay, originally from North Carolina and now a legal resident of St. Thomas, Virgin Islands, and temporarily living in Alexandria, Va., where my wife had a baby last

Friday. It is a girl weighing 7 pounds 11 ounces, and her name is Caroline.

I am a broadcaster; I own a chain of radio broadcasting stations and I produce television shows, mostly country and western. Some of you may have seen one of my shows more recently, the Jimmy Dean Show.

Mr. GIBSON: I am James Gibson, staff associate, Potomac Institute of Washington. We do studies which are related to economic development, equal opportunities, civil rights, problems of the farm industry, and other areas, and I have operated and worked in a number of programs, a variety of which deals with and is related to problems such as we are dealing with here.

The CHAIRMAN: I am Oscar Laurel, and I come from Laredo, Tex., and my position really is the chairman of this meeting.

The chairman of the Commission is the Governor of Kentucky, the Honorable Edward T. Breathitt, who was unable to attend this hearing.

I live on the border in an economically depressed area.

I like to claim, and of course I still do so, and I do not want to engage in any discussion with residents of Nogales or Tucson, but Laredo is the principal port of entry into Mexico.

I see Chief Kelly who used to be there in Laredo as chief of immigration. Would you stand up, I would like to recognize you, Chief Kelly.

Mr. KELLY: Thank you, Mr. Laurel.

The CHAIRMAN: He was the chief of immigration at Laredo for many years and was a fine public servant.

At any rate, we are very happy to be here and we appreciate the manner in which the witnesses are appearing and presenting their testimony. We appreciate further the tremendous interest that the public has taken in the hearings which are taking place today and tomorrow.

It is our purpose, of course, that we make available to everyone an opportunity to appear who has expressed a desire to do so.

In this connection, we are working through the noon hour because we realize many of these witnesses are coming here from far away places, and do not want anyone to have to wait too long, any longer than necessary.

So if you will bear with us, we certainly appreciate your interest. I would like to add that I think the decorum has been wonderful and we appreciate that also very much.

The gentleman that just left here to have lunch and will probably take my place when I go to have lunch in a little while, is Dr. Vivian Henderson, President of Clark College, Atlanta, Ga.

Now we come to another member of the Commission who will introduce herself.

Mrs. JACKSON: My name is Kara Jackson, and when I was first appointed to the Commission, someone in my State in which I now reside wanted to know the reason, and I thought that the best answer I could give was that I was born and reared in rural Mississippi.

Until recently, I have worn two hats in my profession, one as professor of education at Grambling College in Grambling, La. Grambling's history is one devoted to rural education, and at one time, the institution was not called Grambling College but was known as Louisiana Rural Normal. That was when it was a normal school.

The other hat that I have worn, and I am not wearing now, is field consultant for the Southern Education Foundation, which took me throughout the South working with rural schools and with rural school supervisors.

Mr. KING: My name is Wilson King. I am a farmer from northern Illinois, and farming has been my only occupation, and perhaps I should add that it has been my only source of income.

Mr. STANLEY: My name is Miles Stanley, and I am special assistant to President George Meany of the AFL-CIO. I am a native of West Virginia, where I reside, and president of the West Virginia AFL-CIO; and I am chairman of the Eleven State Appalachian Council for the same organization.

Mr. WOODENLEGS: I am John Woodenlegs, Northern Cheyenne, Lame Deer, Mont. We are one of the seven groups in Montana of the Northern Cheyenne.

Mr. KING: Mr. Chairman, there is one gentleman who is not at the table at the present—Mr. Lewis J. Johnson. He is president of the Arkansas Farmers Union, and I am sure he will be back in a little while.

The CHAIRMAN: All right, thank you, Mr. King, for calling it to our attention.

We shall then move on, and the Commission would like to recognize now Harland Padfield from the University of Arizona at Tucson, Ariz.

STATEMENT OF HARLAND PADFIELD

Mr. PADFIELD: I am Harland Padfield, assistant professor of anthropology and research specialist, Bureau of Ethnic Research, Department of Anthropology, University of Arizona. My subject is "The Social Foundations of Rural Poverty in the Southwest."

Let me affirm my desire as a social scientist to attend to the social well-being of all segments of our society. Also, as a scientist I accept the implications of this Commission that the social well-being of *all* our people is not necessarily always achieved by the "natural" workings of the predominate social and economic institutions of the national society. This has nothing to do with private enterprise or socialism. Although I cannot base this upon empirical observation, I am satisfied that unequal distribution of whatever men are striving for—whether it is power, prestige, or the fruits of labor—is inherent in all social systems the world over. This is implicit in the theory of social systems.

No system is natural in the sense of being decreed by a divine power or dictated by the inherent nature of man. All are predominately creations of the imagination of man in all his diversity and, as such, are subject to his conscious influences.

The thing that we are concerned with here, it seems to me, is not that some participants in our system are less advantageously situated than others. We are concerned rather with the degree of relative disadvantagement and, most important of all, with the ways and means available to those at the bottom to change their station.

This is another thing that the study of social systems tells us.

If those at the bottom become too relatively or absolutely great in number, if their position is too vastly lower than those in the mainstream, and if their opportunity to move up is diminishing while at the same time their numbers are increasing; then sooner or later this will become more than the system can bear, and it will break down. It is because of our concern for the welfare of our basic American institutions that we are concerned with poverty.

The Processes Involved

Restricting the generalizability of my remarks to the Southwest, first of all what is meant by "rural poverty"? This deserves some sharpening up. The concept has area implications, cultural implications, and economic implications. If we consider each of these separately, perhaps we will reach a fuller understanding of this social phenomenon, and be more systematic in our programs and policies.

AREA IMPLICATIONS.—The term "rural" implies sparsely settled areas, farm areas, or enclaved (Indian) settlements in sparsely settled or farm areas. Although this aspect is related to the cultural and economic aspects, it is not synonymous with them. However we define its area implications, we have to be somewhat arbitrary or purposeful in our concern with a given region on any of these counts. In an area called rural, we find urban-to-rural migration—the retired and the affluent seeking polutant-free atmosphere, quiet surroundings, or the good life identified with images of our agrarian past. So far as economic activities are concerned, industrial encroachment into rural areas is seen in the forms of health and recreation centers, highly complex military installations, highly automated mining operations, and highly industrialized agricultural business operations. Thus, urban people with urban institutions extend into the area we are concerned with.

On the other hand, in the cities and commercial centers of the Southwest can be found barrios and fringe communities made up of recent emigrants from farm labor camps, Indian reservations, the hinterlands of Mexico, and the plantation settlements of the rural South. Here country people with country mentalities and country ways still economically active in farmwork intrude into the urban milieu. By these criteria, sections of Tucson, Eloy, Casa Grande, Coolidge, Phoenix, Chandler, Mesa, and Yuma must be considered rural. In the Salt River Valley, communities defined as urban by the 1960 census (USDC 1960a:XIII–XV)—such as Guadalupe, El Mirage, and Surprise—are almost entirely rural. The same is true of towns in other Southwestern States.

In a 1963 study of farm labor in Arizona (Padfield and Martin 1965:151–164), we found that less than one-third of the farmworkers engaged in harvesting activities lived on the farms. (Exceptions are the Indians living on reservation, who constituted less than 5 percent of our sample.) The rest either lived in towns of more than 2,500 inhabitants or in the densely settled urban fringes.

Therefore much of the area of the Southwest that can be called rural by demographic criteria will encompass urban features which we must exclude by virtue of our purpose. This same purpose dictates that we include settlements in urban areas.

CULTURAL IMPLICATIONS.—Cultural considerations must enter any thoughtful appraisal of rural poverty, especially in the Southwest. The poverty line is an income standard based on dollars and cents arrived at by Anglo-Americans. It is embedded in middle-class institutions centered upon individual mobility, personal acquisitiveness, and personal consumption. These drives are contradictory to the institutional heritages of the major indigenous cultures of the Southwest. Obligatory sharing of income between extended family, village, or clan kinsmen acts as restraints on the individual Indian's desire to "get ahead," as we call it. One anthropologist (Erasmus 1961:101–134) refers to this characteristic conflict in values between traditional closed societies and modern open societies as "conspicuous giving" versus "conspicuous ownership." This also tends to be true of the Mexican American, where the family is the main focus of social identification, and individualism is in direct conflict with family solidarity. (Madsen 1964:44–46; Padfield and Martin 1965: 184–217).

It is doubtful that our individual minimum income standards are institutionally appropriate to most of the non-Anglo groups in the Southwest. It is ironic that in the midst of our concern for the material welfare of our southwestern rural peoples, we urge them to identify with their traditional institutions while at the same time knowing they are impediments to social mobility in our material world.

Just what the relationships are between income deprivation and the cultural institutions we find associated with it, it is difficult to tell. In the cities it is characteristic for sociologists to take the view that the institutions identified with the poor are conditioned by poverty—hence the term the "culture of poverty." In rural areas, perhaps largely because of the anthropologist's concepts (or bias) of cultural relativism, it is common to take the view that people have a way of life historically continuous. Within these historical institutions are embedded values which rank things like ceremonial responsibility, sharing, large families, and family obligations as most important; and things like new houses, fancy cars, prestige occupations, and annual salary scales—things of the utmost concern to middle-class Anglo Americans—as secondary. There is a tendency among anthropologists also to say that these practices provide as much satisfaction for them as ours do for us. and we should not be alarmed. Today with the pressures of Indian Americans of all tribal affiliations attending public schools, fighting our wars, and moving to the cities, it becomes increasingly more glib for the anthropologist to say this.

Whether low income is a function of culture or vice versa, the important point is that economically relevant behavior and the social institutions to which people are committed are interconnected. We must understand that to transform a family's material circumstances it is necessary to restructure some of the institutions which they hold dear and within which their lives have meaning. This applies to moving people from urban ghettos to modern housing projects (Lewis 1966) and to occupational training programs for low status workers (Stone and Schlamp 1966:231–233). Stable occupational transformations are social transformations as well. To artificially alter the one does not automatically mean the other will follow.

The idea of social integrity is that one is not a simple cause or effect of the other, but that actually both are the same thing and that it is our thinking and talking about them which split them up. Thus, when we scrutinize the four-room house, the dilapidated car, and the $5,000 income of a robust Mexican-American family of 14, we are looking at strong family ties, emotional security, an intermember financial insurance policy, a system of teaching discipline with a minimum of generational conflict by succession of child responsibility for the youngest, pride in family, and—most of all—12 children. The cultural implication is that it is all one ball of wax.

Social and occupational mobility is commonly regarded as an individual achievement, whereas much of the social literature tends to regard poverty as structural. Actually, both are structural; and it is also true that in the case of poverty, choice patterns are involved. To be sure, all of the features of the circumstances we arbitrarily call poverty are not chosen. Just as the middle-class white collar worker, dogged by time payments and keeping up with the Joneses, does not choose his rigid social life, his abject submission to the firm, or his ulcers. However, he does desire to possess a fancy car, a house full of gadgets, and to belong to the proper club. The inference is that poverty also adheres to patterns of social behavior that, if not chosen, are at least enjoyed. This is the second cultural implication—the equilibrium aspect or the social inertia aspect. This means that development and education programs have to supermotivate. Moreover, to have any lasting effect they must be stable and continuous.

ECONOMIC IMPLICATIONS.—In the Southwest people tend to associate rural poverty with farm labor. If poverty is defined solely on the basis of annual income standards, there is justification for this. In our 1963 study of harvest labor in Arizona (Padfield and Martin 1965:146–172), a sample of 600 workers representing cotton, citrus, and lettuce harvesting reported an average annual family income of $3,000. Almost half of all households represented reported less than $2,400, and 24 percent of them took in $4,000 or less.

I should point out that 10 percent earned over $6,000 and 4 percent over $8,000. Also, farm wages generally have risen in the 3 years since our study (ASES 1966:23; Poley 1967). Nevertheless, the impression that farmworkers' wages are among the lowest of any industry is valid (USDC 1960b:1–232).

As in the case of low income and institutionalized patterns of living, the connection between low income and agricultural labor is not a simple, direct cause-and-effect relationship. The first point to be considered is that most farm laborers are ex-farmers. Most are recent emigrants from peasant agriculture in Mexico. Negro Americans, Filipino Americans, and Indian Americans, also significant in farm labor, have sharecropping or subsistence farming backgrounds by and large. Anglo-Americans tend to be one generation removed from farming (Padfield and Martin 1965:184–250). They are generally uniformly low in formal education and have very little occupational diversity. This means most farm laborers have very specialized and very basically established occupational backgrounds. Their skills are specific to agriculture at the primary level of activity.

Socially, this has profound implications. Their institutions adhere to their farming past and their farm-labor present.

In the case of Mexican Americans, labor patterns are built around large families with working children and stable residences in the southern regions of Texas, Arizona, and California where godparent ties and religious obligations stress sharing.

In the case of Negro American farm laborers, matriarchal units with working children bring the plantation institutions of Southeastern United States into the cottonfields of the Southwest.

Indian Americans who participate in farm labor generally do so in order to make it economically feasible to maintain their reservation institutions.

Anglo-Americans, excluding those in the highly paid skilled positions, tend to be social isolates to whom farm labor is a means of maintaining patterns of avoidance of skid row types of institutionalized behavior.

It is not important at this point to spell out in specific detail all of the ethnic ramifications of the one overriding social feature that I am concerned with. The important point is that the institutional matrices of farm laborers by and large commit them to agriculture and tend to perpetuate generationally this technological/institutional arrangement. This is the principle of "institutional fit."

From the standpoint of the agricultural industry in the Southwest, its harvest technologies have developed and stabilized upon the expectations of labor pools of this type. They are, or have been until the last 10 years, labor-intensive. These technologies represent mutual economic and institutional adaptations of management to labor, and vice versa. On the side of management, these technologies are designed to utilize cheap labor at minimum costs. On the side of harvest laborers, they are utilized to accommodate their old institutional patterns and to provide a method of utilizing their obsolescent skills.

So much for the baseline of Southwestern agricultural technologies. Certainly it is not, nor has it ever been, a static system. Labor unions have been active in raising wages and working conditions. The Department of Labor had been instrumental in raising wages by adverse-effect wage floors in connection with the implementation of bracero labor. World War I, World War II, and the Korean War cut deeply into the farm labor pools. All of these pressures collectively and individually have contributed to the upward mobility of labor and capital substitution for labor. Mechanical cotton harvesting was further perfected as a labor alternative during the manpower crises of each war until the Korean War brought it into complete acceptance. Harvesting machines have been developed for beets, potatoes, carrots, and process tomatoes. These crops are almost totally machine harvested now. Mechanical harvest aids are common in melons, lettuce, celery, and citrus. Prototype mechanical harvesters exist now for lettuce. Experimental machines exist for grapes, melon, celery, and citrus harvesting (Harriott 1967). Some of these mechanical alternatives are labor-reducing. Some are for the purpose of reducing arduousness of tasks, which give domestic labor an advantage over immigrant labor.

More discussion of these trends in agricultural technologies would be digressive. The important point economically is that labor-saving alternatives are available and their use is consistent with optimization principles in any industry. In this respect, agriculture is adhering more to the classic pattern of industrialization as time goes along and is losing its peculiar distinction it has held so many years as being based in large part upon primitive technologies. The important point is as labor's position improves in any industry, productivity per man goes up.

In the case of agriculture as opposed to other industries, this has a peculiar effect. It means drastic reduction in the number of people in farm labor. Whereas nonfarm industries generally expand (there are some notable exceptions here) in their capital intensification, thus affording opportunity to absorb their replaced workers in other capacities, agriculture in terms of acreage has not expanded. In fact, acreage has reduced in the last 10 years—both nationally and in the State of Arizona (USDA 1966:450; University of Arizona 1967:128). I don't know about California.

Thus, for agriculture, increased worker mobility means capital substitution and an absolute aggregate reduction in agricultural man-hour inputs. Putting it in terms of the worker—it means higher paying jobs for fewer workers.

Another important sociological implication of this technological change is its differential effects upon the ethnic components in the farm labor supply. I refer to this as the class specificity of technological change. One thing that we must not lose sight of in the labor-management dichotomy is the element of competition within each. Our semantics, which approaches demagoguery in the heat of contention, tends to blur this fact.

Just as small farmers compete with large farmers, unions compete with other unions, and one class of workers within an industry tends to compete with another. In the history of farm labor this has had a distinctive pattern along ethnic lines.

Anglo-Americans generally compete with Mexican Americans. Within the Mexican-American group competitive divisions tend to emerge along the lines of second generation or culturally established Mexican Americans against the recent immigrant, especially those tens of thousands who live on the Mexican side and commute to work. The history of the Southwest has been a seesaw battle on a technological chessboard between the vast labor pools of the Mexican hinterlands and the more technical and highly paid Anglo and Mexican-American northerner.

A technological division also exists among the Anglo segment, where the Anglo isolate more suited to labor-intensive systems tends to be displaced by machine systems.

This is not job competition among individual workers, although there is that—it is institutional competition to see which technological patterns will prevail.

Generally, we find that change in the direction of labor reduction favors the higher class, more urbanized worker. When industry comes in, the labor is generally imported and local people do not benefit. Labor-intensive technologies favor the unsophisticated

—those with more immediate rural backgrounds—those whose institutions require more informal work patterns.

In summary, in our studies of agricultural industrialization in the Southwest, we see the principle of institutional fit which integrates the life styles of the rural worker with the labor-intensive technologies. We see the evidence that increased worker mobility means increased productivity per man and fewer workers. We see that capital substitution, that is, mechanization, has differential effects upon the ethnic class groups now in farm labor.

Recognition of these dynamics is generally lacking in the all too familiar dialog between management and labor spokesmen. The images of big business versus the poverty-stricken grape picker or of the small struggling farmer versus two Goliaths—big labor and big Government—may be emotionally stimulating. They are not very useful in telling us what is really going on or in telling us what effect the changes being advocated will have.

Farm labor is entitled to basic privileges enjoyed by the workers in other industries, such as social security, the right to organize, and an appropriate minimum wage. This is progress—social progress. However, as the costs of their services increase, they can expect increased mechanization and automation. This is technical and economic progress.

The implications are clear. The scaling upward of agricultural occupations along with its many benefits for both the industry and labor force will accelerate obsolescence and unemployment among the unsophisticated rural people most dependent on hand labor.

Thus, poverty of the underemployed will become poverty of the unemployed. This will necessitate more concerted long-range programs of education and support benefits for a large and growing segment of our population.

It is unreasonable for labor to insist that wages continue to rise and at the same time that technologies remain labor-intensive. It is unreasonable for management to insist, agricultural management, that agricultural experiment stations help solve their technical problems but at the same time contend that it is the personal responsibility of workers made obsolete by their increasing technification to upgrade themselves in the "good old American tradition."

It sounds ironic and I do not like saying it, but soon the only truly rural people left in America will have no economically active roles in our production systems. The quicker we get to the serious business of learning solutions to this specific problem aspect of industrialization—the economic obsolescence of rural institutions—instead of calling it the farm labor problem, the more likely we are to diminish poverty in the United States and have something to offer the developing nations of the world.

Recommendations

—That labor and management in agriculture attempt to keep and assimilate the culturally unsophisticated worker in the system. This can be helped by farm labor unions being nondiscriminatory, keeping wage demands realistic, and by management attempting to meet wage increases without accelerating the rate of capital substitution.

—That the cultural context of low income be taken into account.

An adjusted rural worker fully employed in rural work at marginal wages may be better off than an unemployed rural worker in an urban slum.

—The problem of the obsolete worker is going to become more urgent. I think it calls for specialized long-range family-educational programs established on the fringes of large urban areas where rural people migrate. They should be staffed by specially trained (university-trained) teachers and young administrators. These schools should complement rather than compete with the public school system. They should have no entrance and no promotion requirements except good behavior and serious application. They should be aimed at the pre-dropout and dropout group. They should teach technical skills directly and with a minimum of prerequisites, offering courses in basic math and basic American English with specialization in industrial skills for all major industries. The pertinence of these curriculums would be sharpened by direct linkage with construction, factory, and industrial complexes that operate in their regions.

Since emotional stress generally accompanies social and cultural change, social and psychiatric counseling should be an integral part of these family development programs. Group seminars should be emphasized, in which the institutional skills appropriate to industrial society are studied. This includes *procreation standards* and the sophisticated *family economics* of mass society.

Following are the citations referred to in my presentation:

References Cited

ASES (Arizona State Employment Service)
1966. ARIZONA POST-SEASON FARM LABOR REPORT FOR 1965. Farm Placement Division.

Erasmus, C. J.
1961. MAN TAKES CONTROL. Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press.

Poley, J. R.
1967. Personal Communication. (From Dir. Farm Placement Serv., Ariz. State Employment Service.)

Harriott, Bill
1967. Personal Communication. (From Assoc. Agr. Engin., Univ. Ariz.)

Lewis, Oscar
1966. EVEN THE SAINTS CRY. *In* Trans-action, Nov. 1966:18-23.

Madson, William.
1964. THE MEXICAN-AMERICAN OF SOUTH TEXAS. New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Padfield, Harland and Martin, W. E.
1965. FARMERS, WORKERS AND MACHINES: TECHNOLOGICAL AND SOCIAL CHANGE IN FARM INDUSTRIES OF ARIZONA. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.

Stone, Robert C. and Schlamp, F. T.
1966. FAMILY LIFE STYLES BELOW THE POVERTY LINE. A Report to the State Social Welfare Board from the Institute for Social Science Research, San Francisco State College.

University of Arizona
1967. TENTH ARIZONA TOWN HALL ON AGRICULTURE; DO AGRICULTURAL PROBLEMS THREATEN ARIZONA'S TOTAL ECONOMY? Research Rpt. and Resource Mater., prepared by Univ. Ariz. Arizona Academy, Phoenix.

USDA (U.S. Dept. Agr.)
1966. AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS 1965. Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office.

USDC (U.S. DEPT. COMMERCE)
1960a. UNITED STATES CENSUS OF POPULATION, NUMBER OF INHABITANTS. Washington, Bur. Census.

——— 1960b. UNITED STATES CENSUS OF POPULATION, GENERAL SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS. Washington, Bur. Census.

Now, I notice that I was supposed to talk on farm labor in my presentation. Farm labor is mentioned in my presentation, but I have attempted a general approach to this, something which I think anthropology can give us in our understanding of poverty.

Gentlemen, that concludes my presentation and I will be happy to answer any questions you may have.

The **CHAIRMAN**: Have you provided us with a copy of your testimony? We certainly will appreciate it. You have discussed many of the problems which we are very much concerned about, and I am sure your recommendations will be given serious consideration.

Are there any questions by the Commission? I will recognize Mr. Gibson.

Mr. **GIBSON**: A specific point I was interested in was the conflict between the competition, in the area competition for development.

I just wanted to get some reactions from you on the implications of this.

What would you say are some of the implications of this? What innovations are needed to the approach to public works and economic development? What would you represent as the criteria in the areas designated, such as areas of unemployment, low median income, and the other problems we face in this type of area?

Let us say that public works in the form of public roads and public improvements go into these areas where we have the hardcore unemployed persons. How could we help them by increasing the resources of the Federal Government? What are some innovations that you think are needed in the way of public program policies directed to the development of resources in areas such as this?

Mr. **PADFIELD**: I think this family development educational system or plan or program or something like this is one of the few ways that we have of doing something about this.

I think when the head of a family becomes unemployed so long, even though the family goes on welfare—and I certainly feel that a family should not be allowed to live in abject circumstances—There was a study recently that just came out of California on 1,200 welfare families—I just got it last week, and it came from a former university professor here who is now at San Francisco State—and they found in one category that they worked with—a category that they called Long Time Welfare Group—they found that, if anything, it tends to stifle the workers going back to the economic mainstream after they have been on welfare for a long time.

We know that a great deal of money goes into these programs as they now exist. I think that if we took the money that goes into these programs and put it perhaps to a little bit different use, like education, and in a little different educational system, in relation to public works programs and others, I think we could get the people back into the workstream.

But I do think that a public works program would help. The Papago Reservation has a public works program, or did have a time or two there. I did a study, a work study, on Papago labor 2 years ago, and I found evidence that many of the people that I interviewed who were now unemployed had worked very successfully during the time and period of these public works programs on the reservation.

Mr. GIBSON: What sort of public works? Were these programs of economic development, or were they community services, or what?

Mr. PADFIELD: Well, they were community road building, drainage improvement, and several of the CCC type; only they were not that, of course.

Mr. GIBSON: Just one other question.

I did not write down your first recommendation, but I did write down a couple of questions I wanted to ask you about. Would you mind repeating that first recommendation for me?

Mr. PADFIELD: Yes, I think that both farm labor and farm management—well, I think ultimately that farm labor will be organized. It is becoming more organized in California.

I think the unions—the two that have been most active, the AFL-CIO and the Teamsters—I think that the union and the big grower interests should be prevailed upon to see if they cannot keep the people who need to work the most in the system.

The implication here is that whenever wages rise, technical equipment is brought in and these alternatives do exist. For instance, this prototype lettuce harvester which exists now—there is one at the University of Arizona and there is one in California, and this has been brought to a workable state, but it is not used yet. It would be used, I am convinced, if wages in lettuce go up, I don't know how high, but there is a point at which it will pay them to bring in this harvester. However, it has not been reached yet.

But when it does, it will replace probably 20 or 30 or 40 to 1; and the people that will be out are the people we are now speaking of who need the work so badly, and most of them are the rural Mexican-American class of people.

Mr. GIBSON: Is it predominantly for economic or is it for social reasons that you think the mechanization or farming technology should be retarded?

Mr. PADFIELD: I did not hear your last word.

Mr. GIBSON: You think there should be some planned retardation, is that correct?

Mr. PADFIELD: Oh, yes.

Mr. GIBSON: For economic or social reasons predominantly?

Mr. PADFIELD: For social reasons predominantly.

Mr. GIBSON: Do you believe that the impetus of our economic or technological development has infected or has affected our sociology, or social values, to the extent that it would be unnatural to expect that sort of retardation? How feasible do you think such retardation is?

Mr. PADFIELD: I understand your question, I think, and I do not think it is too reasonable. I don't think that it will happen. That is exactly the trouble—unfortunately, for agriculture, I think. Agriculture has been probably the last industry to industrialize. If it had been the first, then this probably could not have happened; but had it been, I think we would find now the obsolete worker in someone else's camp, in some industry other than agriculture.

But, agriculture being the last one to industrialize, I think it finds itself equated more with the plight of what is a common industrial problem than just a farm problem.

Mr. Gibson: Now I am just not being contentious about this. I am concerned with whether or not the interest which we all share, the long-range interest, and not just the short-range interest, what might be best for the kind of place we would like for our children and grandchildren to grow up in.

Is there something that you feel is going to be lost, irreparably, that would be very harmful to the kind of environment, the kind of world, the kind of nation we will have if this retardation does not take place; or is it more in terms of consideration of the plight, in the short-term sense, of those affected by this situation?

Mr. Padfield: I am thinking in long range. I do not think it would be the solution. I do not think this would be the solution by any means, because the problem of the obsolete worker is too vast for that.

We find already in the very great cities of this country rural people in the slums. That is what they are, and they are there, and they are never going to go back.

This retarding, as you call it, of the farm technification, so to speak, will not solve their problems. We have hundreds of thousands of people like this in urban areas which the farm situation would never affect under any circumstances.

I just think it would help slow down the migration of people out of the agricultural and rural areas to the slums.

There is evidence in our study—we did some longitudinal analyses of farm laborers' histories. We found that the most rural type of worker that you could find did tend to come up and did tend to take over machinery operation. We found that this occurred in instances where the technification had occurred more slowly. Instead of finding thousands of Anglo-American technical elite people swarming into the regions and replacing the more rural type of worker, we find where it occurred more slowly that the people that were there originally moved out and began to operate the machinery.

I think we had a witness this morning whose husband was the operator of a cotton-picking machine. This is significant; and we are finding more and more Indian Americans, too, who are operating machinery, expensive machinery.

Mr. Gibson: Thank you.

Mr. Henderson: Chairman Laurel has gone to lunch, so I will conduct the meeting until he returns.

Now, there is a question on my right. Dr. Roessel.

Mr. Roessel: Yes, thank you. You mentioned in part of your statement to us that merely raising the income is not going to solve the problems because there are matters that relate to culture and values.

What is your suggestion here in terms of what can be done? You have made specific suggestions in terms of the more technical part of it; but how do you go about, or do you want to go about, changing people's values or cultures so that they can make this adjustment?

Mr. **PADFIELD**: I do not think we can avoid that. My answer to your question would be yes.

As an anthropologist, I have struggled over this dilemma for a long time myself. I have also discussed it with members of our faculty and with other anthropologists and there is a great deal of ambivalence about this among anthropologists.

But I am tending to increasingly take the view that we really cannot avoid assimilating the Indian Americans and the more rural peoples of the Southwest into the mainstream of our society. I guess really what I am talking about is, how we do it. I don't think we could keep them from entering the mainstream, even if we wanted to. I am just thinking or I am just saying that I think we should get together on our approaches. We need to know what we are doing.

There is the generational aspect. I think it is unrealistic to expect to have the older Indian American, those who are monolingual, those who do not know English too well, maybe 45 or 50 years old —I do not think we can expect these people to be trained, but I think we can their children.

Mr. **ROESSEL**: Well, what role does the individual play in this? Let's say that we are talking about one of your Papago friends. Let's say that they do not feel that this assimilation is in their best interests, that they would resist it. What do you do, or what do they do, or how do you resolve that conflict?

Mr. **PADFIELD**: Well, I think one way to resolve it—and I know this tends to be a little glib, too—but, the felt-need aspect.

I do not think that the need sometimes comes in the form of a verbalized request or formal memorandum from the tribe or anything like that. But I do think that the felt-need aspect is important where a group or a subgroup of Indian Americans in cities, for instance—obviously, they want, and they are reaching out; there is a felt-need, and I think we should respond.

On the other hand, on reservations, with the older people, I do not think we should run out and encourage them to change so fast, at least overnight. We should be a little more careful about it.

Mr. **ROESSEL**: Are they involved in the decision you are making? In other words, this is the point I am trying to make, are you saying that you and I, because of our knowledge and our ability to look at something in depth and in breadth, we then are in a position or we are in a better position to make a decision which involves an individual who may not want to go along with our decision; or does that individual have the right to disagree and dissent and to tell us that he does not want our help?

Mr. **PADFIELD**: He does by all means have that right, and I agree with your latter statement. I believe we should be very careful about this.

Mr. **ROESSEL**: Thank you very much.

Mr. **HENDERSON**: All right, do you have a question, Dr. Davis?

Mr. **LAWRENCE DAVIS**: I just have one. It is fine to get our wonderful theories on all of that, and we can understand these things in our discussion.

But, getting to the point of food, clothing, shelter, and jobs, and education for children and their entire future—getting to this point, we have to have some immediate programs to help people while all these other things are taking place, this assimilation, and so forth.

Now, earlier in your discussion, and I hope I have interpreted you correctly, you talked in terms of a system, that we have to do something because as the numbers of people increase, we are in a bad economic situation, and the system becomes important.

Would it be your opinion that maybe instead of worrying about the system, we need to worry about the people first; and the system will sort of be taken care of?

We get right down to the immediate problems of the people—food, clothing, shelter, and so forth—and it seems to me that if our whole emphasis is toward the well-being of people, that it tends to protect our system; but we are concerned about the people, and they are our initial concern, and not the system, and I think it is being put a little bit backwards. Would you comment on that just a little bit, please?

Mr. **PADFIELD**: I agree with your humanitarian emphasis. I find no disagreement at all with that.

It is just that I don't think that we can really minister to people unless we understand the system. When I am speaking of the system, I am not talking about the private enterprise system, or the system of politics, or anything like that. I mean their institutions and their place in the new institutions that they have to go into.

I don't think we can presume to help them unless we know them in depth; and part of understanding a man is to know the institutions to which he belongs. He is more than just something that needs food and clothing and shelter. I think this is part of the problem. They also need a role, they need respect, they need dignity. I do not think they can have dignity unless they have a place in our society. And I do not think that food and clothing alone is the answer.

Mr. **LAWRENCE DAVIS**: No, but you really are concerned about the people, are you not? When you were speaking of the system, you were really speaking of the individual people in the system, and your interest is directed toward the people?

Mr. **PADFIELD**: Yes, of course.

Mr. **LAWRENCE DAVIS**: Thank you very much.

Mr. **HENDERSON**: I just want to ask one quick question. You mentioned the impact of technology and the realistic force at work with which we have to contend, and you suggested that labor and management should get together in spite of these economic advances and consider the workers in their programs.

You also expressed—as part of the objectives of your views, I think that you expressed a desire to slow down the migration from the rural areas into the cities. I believe you stated that as part of your objectives.

Now, I am trying to get to this one point: Do you have a view with regard to the farm ownership of the small farmer? I know you have emphasized farmworkers and the labor of the entire people. Do you have any view with regard to farm ownership—land policies, for example, that might enhance farm ownership—as part of this assimilation process, as part of the process of retaining the people so they can exist within this particular rural atmosphere? That is one aspect of the question.

The second aspect of my question is, what about the impact of agricultural policies themselves, over and beyond technology and mechanization per se? Do you have any views on these as to their impact of pushing people off the farms, with respect to the magnifying of the problems in the Southwest?

Mr. PADFIELD: The first question of farm ownership—boy, that is another of these emotional issues.

Mr. HENDERSON: Well, it is not emotional from my point of view. I just want to make my point clear. I am concerned about policy recommendations that may affect rural life, the extent to which provisions in the public policy should be made as to land ownership for people who want to remain on the farm. These are real hard questions from my point of view.

Mr. PADFIELD: I do not know the answer to this question. I say this not falsely humble, or anything like that, because right now this is one of the most urgent questions in the underdeveloped nations.

Right now, I am attempting to formulate a research project to study the small farm in Mexico, and what is happening to it.

In Latin America, there is initial concern for small farmers. There seems to be a debate—I do not think it is right to say debate between people—but there is a debate in forces that seems to be going on about the farm situation.

It seems that because of the need to increase output per acre, the need to get more food out of the soil—and this is related to machinery in the sense that machinery can operate in larger units of land—these are some of the dynamics that seem to say that farms are going to continue to get bigger.

I know that this worsens the plight of many rural people; but I don't know the answer to it myself.

Mr. HENDERSON: Now, I think you have the thrust of my question. There are public policies that have to be in existence and others that have to be made based on recommendations as to the extent to which small farm operations should be encouraged and the extent to which cooperatives should be encouraged, and the need for development, and this problem of bringing about liabilities in certain areas. I am going to ask this question again during the hearings, because this is very important to me.

Now, what about the second part of my question—about agricultural policies?

Mr. PADFIELD: These are questions, I think, for the agriculture economists. I think they would be more prepared to answer it than myself.

From an institutional standpoint, it is desirable, I think, to keep the small farm; but economically, I just don't know.

Mr. HENDERSON: Thank you very much.

Mr. KING: May I ask a question?

Mr. HENDERSON: You go right ahead.

Mr. KING: I really don't have a question, but I would like to bring back a point that I thought Mr. Padfield made that I thought was very good.

You mentioned many people hidden by our census report, not the people who had gotten into the slums of the cities, or not the people who, like myself, the 3 percent or 4 percent or 5 percent that we talk about in political life or sociological life as farmers; but those inbetween people who live in areas whose population density is urban in formation but yet rural in custom and country living; and, I think—I am not asking a question—but I think that was a very important point and I wanted to bring it back up just so the folks around the table here will keep that in mind. I think that was a very good contribution.

Mr. **PADFIELD**: Thank you.

The **CHAIRMAN**: Thank you, Mr. Padfield. I believe those are all the questions.

Mr. **STANLEY**: I have a question, Mr. Chairman.

The **CHAIRMAN**: All right, Mr. Stanley, go right ahead.

Mr. **STANLEY**: I would like to ask just one question here very hurriedly, and I may be repetitive, because I missed portions of Mr. Padfield's testimony.

You used the term "labor-management and their joint responsibility"—labor and management—and of course I have a special interest in that field; again, completely aside from whatever emotional interest I may have, I do have a real interest in it.

One of the problems, comparatively speaking (and I think this was inclusive in your statement) farmworkers do not have the right to organize, and even though they are organizing—this right may come later—but at the present time they have no voice in any discussion regarding organized labor.

Now, do you think they should be organized?

Mr. **PADFIELD**: Yes, I think they should be organized. Certainly, they have as much right as any labor group.

Mr. **STANLEY**: Now, secondly, and very quickly, you indicated that technology would eliminate unskilled jobs in the fields of agriculture as well as industry. Of course, this is true. I come from a coal-mining region where we have been hit rather hard; and it would be no different than what it has been in steel, mining, and in all of those different industries.

You also said that you did not believe that labor had a right to insist on wages being increased, and at the same time try to impede technological progress by insisting that the industry remain with a high labor intensity, or generally those are the terms that you used.

Now, I am just asking you, is this happening now, is this occurring? Implicit as your statement, as I understood it, was that this was actually happening; while labor is insisting that wages increase they are insisting also that the owners not industrialize their operations. Is that your statement?

Mr. **PADFIELD**: I think it is happening to a certain extent. Now I do not take the position that labor does not have the right to do this. They have the right to insist on anything.

I am simply saying that I think it will occur in spite of their effort to cut down the replacement of workers by machines.

That is what I mean, and they have a perfect right to go to the bargaining table with this kind of a package.

The changes that occurred in the railroad industry were quite publicized not too long ago in this respect, with regard to the obsolete workers that were still kept on.

In the farm industry, I don't know if this has occurred on the part of labor.

Mr. STANLEY: Well, generally speaking, the industry is not well enough organized for this type of bargaining. I think that would be the case in this situation.

Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions? (No response.)

Thank you again, Mr. Padfield.

Mr. PADFIELD: Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: I would like to recognize a distinguished member of the Commission who has just joined us here. He is Herman Gallegos from California, and he is presently a consultant to the Ford Foundation. We welcome you, Herman.

Mr. GALLEGOS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: I would like to recognize at this time Mr. Michael Peevey, director of research, California Federation of Labor, AFL-CIO, from San Francisco, Calif.

Just as a matter of warning, after Mr. Peevey completes his testimony, which should be within the next 30 minutes, the Commission will be calling Tom Martinez of the Community Service Organization from Bakersfield, Calif., so that he may be ready to present his statement.

Now, you may proceed, Mr. Peevey.

First, however, just a word about the noise. If it becomes impossible to hear above the noise of our neighbors next door, we may have to interrupt the proceedings, but it will just be for a moment.

I am sorry Mr. Peevey, you may begin now.

Mr. PEEVEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: All right, you may proceed.

STATEMENT OF MICHAEL PEEVEY

Mr. PEEVEY: My name is Michael Peevey and I am director of research for the California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO. I am testifying today in behalf of Thos. L. Pitts, secretary-treasurer of the federation. The federation represents 1.5 million AFL-CIO members in California, including many employed and living in the rural areas of our State.

We welcome this opportunity to testify here today, for the California Labor Federation has long been concerned with the problems of rural poverty. Our testimony covers three particular subjects: Farm labor; water resources development; and some thoughts about improving the annual employment prospects of rural workers.

First, the position of the California labor movement regarding the problem of farm labor is simple. We have opposed importation of foreign farmworkers and have strongly supported efforts to extend the social legislation enacted over the past 30 years to farmworkers. We applauded Congress' recognition that the nation cannot fight rural poverty while permitting the importation of foreign farmworkers under Public Law 78 (the now defunct bracero program). Our basic position is that farm employers must compete in a free labor market with other employers and that the unique status granted agriculture among the nation's industries must be terminated.

The battle to improve the economic well-being of hired workers on the farm has been waged for many, many years. Despite the efforts of organized labor and some church and citizens groups, however, there is little doubt that with each passing year domestic farmworkers have fallen farther behind their industrial brethren.

One example illustrates this point clearly. The 1910 Yearbook of the U.S. Department of Agriculture listed the variety of nonmonetary benefits enjoyed by hired farmworkers 57 years ago. The benefits included family housing, fuel, laundry services, and a horse and buggy for social purposes—all at the employer's expense. Added to a farmworker's cash wages, the Department of Agriculture found that a 1910 farmworker earned—

> . . . perhaps more than the motorman or streetcar conductor gets, and very likely in most cases a larger amount than he would be likely to earn in any occupation open to him in the city.

Today the thought of comparing a farmworker's earnings with that of a streetcar conductor or busdriver seems revolutionary. Last year, California farmworkers averaged a little above $1.50 an hour, with no fringe benefits. The present recruitment of streetcar operators in San Francisco is on the basis of a $3.22 hourly wage, paid holidays, paid vacations, sick leave, health and life insurance benefits, retirement benefits, and other fringes on top of year-round employment.

Several recent events suggest the battle to reverse this long-term downward trend is gaining momentum. The national commitment to wage war on poverty has made the perpetuation of rural poverty seem intolerable. The termination of the bracero program was a necessary precondition to improving the life of farmworkers.

The Delano grape strike—now nearly 1½ years old—has dramatized anew the plight of domestic farmworkers, by focusing national attention upon the deprivation existing in California's fertile valleys. It has further emphasized the unwillingness of growers to bargain collectively with their work force.

Together, these events have brought about renewed cries by concerned citizens in all walks of life that this national shame be eradicated.

In order to place the current farm labor situation in the proper perspective, a brief review of the past history of grower-worker relations in the State is necessary.

Unlike farming throughout most of the nation, agriculture in California and many other parts of the West is characterized by large-scale operations. Gigantic landholdings abound. Organizations such as the Kern County Land Company, Southern Pacific Railroad, the El Tejon Ranch, the Irvine Company, California Packing Corporation, DiGiorgio Corporation, and others own and control hundreds of thousands of acres. Behind them in size of holdings, but still with tremendous economic power, are numerous other big corporate interests with extensive holdings in agriculture. These large landholdings mean that unlike agriculture in a State like Iowa, where farming is done by the owner-operator and family, California agriculture needs a large supply of farmworkers to harvest its crops.

For many years, corporate agriculture relied to a major extent upon foreign farmworkers to meet its needs. In earlier years, heavy reliance was placed on workers from the Far East, particularly Japanese and Filipinos. In recent years large numbers of foreign farmworkers came from Mexico.

At the same time that heavy reliance was placed on foreign farm labor, there has been a conscious and, to date, successful effort to exclude domestic farmworkers from the social legislation enacted during the 1930's and since. While the stated reasons for excluding farmworkers from the coverage of the National Labor Relations Act and the nation's unemployment insurance system may differ from grower to grower, the major reason was to keep wages and working conditions down in order to prove the claim made by agri-business spokesmen that there was and is a shortage of domestic farm labor.

It seems incredible that such a position—enshrined in national law by Public Law 78—could have remained national policy for so long. Year in and year out for the last 50 years farm employment has declined. Hundreds of thousands of persons each year leave rural areas and migrate to the cities. In face of this clear evidence of an oversupply of farmworkers, to hold that there was and still is a farmworker shortage is patently ridiculous.

The tremendous imbalance between the two partners to the relationship in agriculture—the farmworker and the corporate grower—has long been recognized. Its continued existence despite recognition of the waste, deprivation, and human suffering it entails, attests to the political and economic power of large-scale agriculture.

Over 20 years ago the Committee on Education and Labor of the United States Senate made an exhaustive study of industrialized California agriculture. Senator Robert M. LaFollette, Jr., was in charge of the investigation into violations of the rights of free speech and assembly and undue interference with the rights of agricultural labor to organize and bargain collectively. The Committee's counsel was the current Secretary of the Treasury, Henry Fowler. Some of the consequences of the concentration of land ownership and control coupled with the lack of protections for farmworkers were spelled out by the Committee when it stated:

> The economic and social status normally accorded to either the American farmer or industrial worker is denied the agricultural worker. This denial is rooted deeply in the history and structure of the California system of agriculture. . . .

The same Senate report, after describing the imbalances existing between farmworker and employer, said:

> . . . it becomes essential to reappraise the wisdom of the existing public policy that leaves the complete control of employer-employee relationships in a large part of industrialized agriculture in the hands of employers' associations beyond the reach of tempering employee sentiment and protective public regulation. Specifically, there should be a review of the present policy of exempting industrialized agricultural labor from labor legislation such as the Fair Labor Standards Act, the Social Security Act, the National Labor Relations Act, and various types of State labor laws.

The report also noted that:

> . . . the unusual character of the agricultural labor market, the extraordinary poverty and the underprivileged status of this type of labor will require . . . the application of special housing, relief, health, and educational facilities and, probably, unusual public controls of the seasonal labor supply.

And:

> Collective action by the hired workers in industrialized agriculture, supplemented by social action of governmental agencies, similar to that applied to other industry, must become the order of the day.

Senator LaFollette introduced five bills to help remedy the deplorable conditions the Committee had described in length. The most important would have covered farmworkers under the National Labor Relations Act and the Fair Labor Standards Act and provided farmworkers with unemployment insurance. The fate of these bills is well known.

Since the end of World War II the relative position of farmworkers in the economy, largely reflecting the injustices of the bracero program, steadily grew worse. In 1950, for example, average hourly earnings of production workers in California manufacturing were $1.65; average hourly earnings of farmworkers were 88 cents. Over the next 16 years this gap steadily widened.

Last year average hourly earnings of production workers were $3.16. The earnings of farmworkers were $1.52. The difference between these two wage rates is $1.64 an hour. In other words, the gap between the earnings of production workers and domestic farmworkers in California increased from 77 cents an hour in 1950 to $1.64 an hour in 1966. In fact, over the past 16 years farmworker earnings in California increased at a slower rate than farmworker earnings in the balance of the United States.

Data comparing farmworker productivity increases with wage gains also indicate that farmworkers have shared little in the increased productivity of agriculture. Over the past 10 years the increase of output per man-hour—that is, the productivity of farmworkers—rose about 65 percent. The President's Council of Economic Advisors has stated for some years that wage rates should rise at a rate equal to the overall increase in national productivity, with more rapid increases justified in low wage industries. Bypassing at this time the equity questions inherent in the establishment of national wage-price guideposts, the fact remains that farmworker earnings have risen only half as rapidly as farmworker productivity over the past 10 years. Thus, farmworkers have received only a small part of the benefits of their increased output per man-hour.

Domestic farmworkers, in short, have been among the neglected few in a society where the majority of people now live in relative affluence.

They have been excluded from the social welfare and fringe benefit gains most workers take for granted. Not only are farmworkers not covered by the basic labor laws of the United States, but paid vacations, overtime pay, pension plans, and health and welfare programs are virtually nonexistent.

In addition, farmwork is sporadic. One of the greatest evils of the bracero program was that it permitted employers to overlook the need to stabilize agricultural employment because of the availability of large numbers of foreign contract workers.

The average California farmworker is employed little more than 1,100 hours a year. Most workers spend about double this amount of time on the job annually. Even if a farmworker earned $3 an hour—about double the current wage—earnings for an entire year, assuming 1,100 hours of employment, would only yield an income approximating the "poverty line" set by the National Administration.

Annual earnings data from State disability insurance records for 1964 indicate that the large majority of farmworkers live in severe poverty. Median annual earnings of male workers with earnings solely in agriculture were $681. Looking only at men in the so-called prime working years—that is, between the ages of 30 and 50—median annual earnings were $1,622 for those between 30 and 40 and $1,343 for those between 40 and 50 years of age.

Only 31 percent of the male workers between the ages of 30 and 50 earned $3,000 or more per annum. In other words, approximately 7 out of 10 males between 30 and 50 years of age, with earnings only from farmwork, earned less than the "poverty line" figure of $3,000 per year.

The legacy left by the exclusion of domestic farmworkers from the nation's social legislation and by the annual massive importation of foreign contract labor is clearly visible. Rural slums exist throughout the State's agricultural areas. Public health hazards in many rural areas are glaring, as are malnutrition and the lack of proper medical attention. Low levels of educational attainment and a paucity of occupational skills are much in evidence. Inevitably, juvenile delinquency and more serious crimes are encouraged by the climate of want and the sense of hopelessness that prevail. By default or design, domestic farmworkers are considered second-class citizens in a society committed to eliminating such citizenship.

The years 1965 and 1966 were ones of transition. The changeover to reliance upon domestic farm labor, as important as it is, however, represents only the first step in the overall effort to insure that farmworkers enjoy a position in the national economy similar to workers in other industries.

Transition periods are always difficult. The past 2 years were made more difficult than necessary because, despite clear congressional intent as early as summer 1963 that Public Law 78 would not be renewed, large segments of the grower community did not prepare for the change. Instead, they tried to use their political and economic muscle to force the Federal Government into continuing the bracero program under a different guise—Public Law 414.

Many growers, in 1966, still refused to adequately recruit domestic workers—believing that at the last minute, despite warnings, the U.S. Department of Labor would bow to their demands for foreign contract workers. In this they were practicing a form of brinkmanship, with the threat in this case being the time-honored cry of crops "rotting in the fields."

Despite such attempts by growers, however, California gross farm income has continued to increase. Last year gross agricultural income in California was about $3.85 billion compared to $3.7 billion in 1965 and $3.65 billion in 1964. Farmworker earnings have risen, albeit modestly, and domestic employment has increased significantly. In 1966 domestic farmworker earnings in California were about $800 million compared to $730 million in 1965 and only $616 million in 1964. In addition, the nation's balance of payments has been enhanced because the earnings of

Mexican nationals were cut from $78 million in 1964 to only $10 million in 1965 and even less in 1966.

The events of the past 2 years clearly indicate that foreign farmworkers are not needed to harvest the State's crops and effectively buried the old and cleverly nurtured myth that domestic workers cannot do "stoop labor." The experience also indicated that the few insignificant crop losses that occurred were not attributable to a shortage of domestic workers but to inadequate and inefficient grower recruitment practices. Moreover, increased farmworker purchasing power and the retention of farmworker earnings within the State eclipsed purported crop losses. The past 2 years also have proved that domestic farmworkers are available if paid sufficient wages, treated decently, and fed well. However, growers seem slow to recognize that farmworkers must be paid enough to support their families in a modicum of comfort.

The events of the last few years also suggest that domestic farmworkers are likely to remain second-class citizens in an affluent economy unless the social-economic legislation applicable to most of the nation's workers is extended to them. In this regard, the recommendations made by the California Farm Labor Panel in its final report to Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz in December 1965 are particularly noteworthy. One recommendation of that report stated:

> We believe that the farmworker should be protected by the same social legislation as are his counterparts in industry.

The Panel also recommended that the growers of this State adopt a wage policy:

> . . . which will make California agriculture competitive with other industries for labor. At the same time, we urge the Federal Government to take the necessary steps to raise farm labor wages throughout the country.
>
> We believe that hourly rates should not fall below those prescribed by Federal or State minimum wage laws not otherwise applicable to farm labor . . .

The California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO, wholeheartedly endorses the above recommendations. We believe that national legislation to (1) extend to farmworkers coverage of the National Labor Relations Act, (2) prohibit the employment of minors in agriculture, and (3) cover farmworkers under the nation's unemployment insurance system is essential in the battle to extend economic democracy to agriculture.

The particular importance of extending the National Labor Relations Act to cover employer-employee relationships in agriculture cannot be overstated. At present farmworkers cannot achieve a collective bargaining relationship with an employer except to the extent that the employer is willing to enter into such a relationship. While the employer is free to bargain with his employees, he need not. Thus, in a practical sense, collective bargaining may occur only in those cases where farmworkers, through strikes, boycotts, or other activities, are able to force employers to bargain. This, of course, is exactly the situation existing in Delano, Calif., and the Rio Grande Valley of Texas today. As long as it remains Government policy to exclude farmworkers from coverage under the National Labor Relations Act and similar State laws, strikes will tend to remain an integral part of the procedure farmworkers must follow in seeking to obtain collective bargaining status.

Yet the stated purpose of the NLRA and similar State acts is to eliminate or reduce employer-employee strife. Farmworkers are today in an analogous position—with regard to their organizational and collective bargaining rights—to factory workers prior to the passage of the Wagner Act in 1935. Likewise, farm employers are in the same position as factory employers prior to 1935. History is full of examples of the use, in those earlier days, of such devices as the "blacklist," labor spies, and "yellow dog contracts." Similar practices exist today in agriculture, and they exist for the same reason. They are made possible by the lack of legislation guaranteeing farmworkers organizing rights.

The current practice of excluding farmworkers from the nation's basic labor-management law also discriminates against the agricultural industry. This is because our national labor policy seeks, as a desirable goal, the reduction of employer-employee strife adversely affecting commerce. The aim of promoting, encouraging, and protecting the free flow of commerce by the removal of obstacles to constructive and orderly employee-employer relations is as valid today as it was in the 1930's. It is also as necessary today in agriculture as it is in other industries.

The Delano grape strike and similar organizational strikes indicate that unless farmworkers are brought under the NLRA there will be continued strife, because farmworkers cannot petition for NLRB elections. They cannot vote in an election to show what union, if any, represents the majority of the workers. The employer is not required in accordance with the law to bargain with the union they may have selected. Moreover, farmworkers cannot go to the NLRB and the courts to get relief from specific and provable unfair employer labor practices.

All these recourses are accepted in other industries and have generally resulted in peaceful labor-management relations. Yet they are specifically closed to farmworkers. In the struggle to organize, the only recourse farmworkers have is the strike and the boycott.

Growers often say that if workers are given the practical right to organize into unions by the NLRA, or by similar legislation at the State level, there will be strikes during harvesttime and crops will be ruined. Ironically, it is a failure to provide farmworkers coverage under the NLRA which causes harvesttime strikes. When there is no legal machinery to peaceably resolve questions of union recognition, there will be strikes, bitterness, and divided communities.

The fact is that where fair labor-management relations exist under collective bargaining, strikes are the exception—not the rule. That is the situation in the California food and canning industry. In addition, growers will find that a labor-management contract allows them to predict and plan labor costs over a period of years. Growers can also find unions helpful in getting workers if there is a shortage, and unions are generally helpful in dealing with other mutual problems.

It must be remembered that growers and workers have many mutual interests. Both are desirous of increased sales—a grower because they will increase his profits—a union because they affect the union's ability to protect the welfare of its members. This type of cooperation stems from the enlightened self-interest of workers and management and is an outgrowth of normal and harmonious labor-management relations.

Another point bears mention here. Often future relations between a union and an employer are greatly influenced by the conditions under which the workers organize and win their first contract. If this process is one of bitterness and hatred, labor-management relations for many years are often colored by these initial problems. Conversely, fair and rational dealings in the organizing and initial collective bargaining situation tend to set a pattern. Therefore, at this time, agriculture in California and throughout the country is at the crossroads. Farmworkers will organize. The question is, will the growers' response cause organization to occur amidst tremendous labor-management strife or will the growers' response allow it to happen peaceably in accordance with established procedure. Either way, farmworkers will become union members. The choice lies with the growers. If they seek peaceful and constructive labor-management relations in agriculture in the future, they must pave the way for such relations now.

In this regard, the claim is often made by growers that however desirable collective bargaining may be for workers and employers in other industries, it is not suited for agriculture. It is claimed that agriculture is unique largely because the grower produces a perishable product and is dependent, in large part, on natural forces.

In fact, many growers have stated that collective bargaining in agriculture cannot work; that a system cannot be devised. Senator Robert Kennedy of New York, when in Visalia, Calif., on March 16, 1966, said, in response to such a statement:

> If we can put a man on the moon by the end of the 1960's it seems we should be able to work out such a simple problem for farmworkers after 30 years of talking about it.

Prior to the organization of the automotive industry and the steel industry in the 1930's both claimed that, while collective bargaining may be desirable as a national goal, it was not workable in their particular industries. Likewise, the canning and preserving industry made the same claim before it was organized.

The canning industry handles a perishable product, yet collective bargaining has successfully worked in this California industry for nearly 30 years. Moreover, the United Packinghouse Workers of America, AFL-CIO, have numerous collective bargaining agreements covering shed workers who handle produce directly from the fields. Crops, once they leave the fields for the sheds are as perishable, if not more so, than prior to their picking. Yet through collective bargaining, contracts are hammered out in this particular segment of the agricultural industry without crop losses. In fact, collective bargaining in this segment of the industry, as in canning, has become an acceptable way of life for both employers and workers.

Likewise, fieldworkers have been organized into unions for many years in Hawaii, and in many other nations of the world, notably in Australia and in some European countries. As in the canning industry, in shed work, in dairies, and in tanning, collective bargaining has gone on routinely for many years without major complaints from either workers or employers.

Farmworkers are pursuing their right to organize for collective bargaining purposes. The crucial question is, are they going to do so within the framework of a system that provides an orderly, logical, and reasonable means of demonstrating their organizing desire or are they going to be forced to demonstrate their determination by direct action that, of necessity, means interruption of the agricultural process? As a society we must ask ourselves, are we going to encourage agricultural stability and cooperation among grower and worker, or are we going to continue to encourage conflict and strife by allowing the "law of the jungle" to prevail as it did in other segments of the American economy prior to enactment of the Wagner Act in the 1930's?

Collective bargaining is an extremely adaptable and flexible institution. In the final analysis the way it is employed in agriculture depends on the intelligence, the ingenuity, the respect, and the desire of both parties to use the collective bargaining arrangement.

The lesson of the past 2 years is that domestic farmworkers, who for so long have been denied their rightful place in American economic life, are now moving toward this goal. They simply seek what other workers have achieved and they are infused with the spirit expressed in Woody Guthrie's memorable ballad "Pastures of Plenty":

> Every State in this Union us migrants have been, and we'll work in this fight and we'll fight 'til we win.

In this connection I would venture to add that future historians, looking back on this era of ferment, will be both amused and amazed that it has taken us so long, particularly with so many precedents available in many other diverse industries, to settle peaceably the employer-employee relationship problems in agriculture.

To sum up, the California Labor Federation respectfully urges that this Commission, in submitting its report to the President's Committee on Rural Poverty, include the following basic recommendations:

(1) That farmworkers be covered, as are most other workers in the nation's economy, under the National Labor Relations Act.

(2) That farmworkers be fully covered under the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act. In this regard it is interesting to note Congress took a significant step in this direction last year when they included approximately 390,000 farmworkers under the Act. Yet, the protection granted to farmworkers is sharply limited. Only about one-quarter of the farmworkers in the country are covered and even this group is entitled to a minimum wage that, when it reaches its peak, will only be $1.30—30 cents beneath the minimum wage specified for other covered workers. Moreover, farmworkers are specifically excluded from the premium pay for overtime work provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

(3) That domestic farmworkers be protected from having to compete with workers from abroad. At the present time some foreign farmworkers are still being imported into this country under Public Law 414. This program inevitably has an adverse effect upon domestic farmworkers and should be terminated.

(4) That unemployment insurance be extended to farmworkers. The present exclusion of farmworkers from coverage under the

nation's unemployment insurance program is discriminatory, wasteful, inefficient, and acts to increase welfare costs.

(5) That farmworkers be covered in every State by workmen's compensation laws.

(6) That public welfare systems be extended to migratory farmworkers and their families without regard to State residence requirements.

If the above-listed recommendations are achieved, all segments of the agricultural community—workers, growers, processors, and the general public—would benefit.

Secondly, in the field of water resources development the California Labor Federation has long been active. The California labor movement has long supported Federal reclamation law and the use of 40-year, interest-free loans to bring about the orderly and equitable development of land for family farming. Our history of concern in the matter of bringing water to the arid regions of the West can be traced back to the 1870's. Our policy since that time has been undeviating—we have staunchly supported Federal reclamation law and have opposed programs and policies that tend to foster land monopoly.

We have been concerned for some time over the failure of the U.S. Department of the Interior to enforce the excess land ownership provisions of reclamation law in certain parts of California. Federal reclamation programs, when first promulgated, could be viewed as an early Economic Opportunity Act for young and poor farmers. Now, however, Federal reclamation programs are tending to become just another large Federal subsidy to corporate farmers and absentee investors. Instead of fighting rural poverty, Federal reclamation programs, as presently administered, tend to perpetuate rural poverty.

Federally financed water development projects, when the antimonopoly provisions of Federal reclamation law are unenforced, or through subterfuges are circumvented, act to strengthen those centers of economic and political power that benefited from the infamous bracero program and which continue to oppose the legitimate goals of farmworkers. Moreover, the same special interest groups which benefit from the nonenforcement of reclamation law continue to drive small farmers out of business.

The simple fact is that Federal reclamation programs in California and other areas of the West, partially through administrative decisions and lack of enforcement by the U.S. Department of the Interior, have tended to become, in part, Federal subsidies to corporate farmers and absentee investors.

In this connection, one of the most meaningful ways to attack rural poverty in California would be to rapidly break up the approximately 900,000 acres of federally financed irrigated land presently held in violation of reclamation law. This land could be sub-divided and then settled by family farmers aided by low interest Federal credit programs. A particularly beneficial result of this action would be the establishment of small farm communities and the subsequent growth of jobs for building tradesmen, service employees, retail sales personnel, and others. This would have other benefits because communities of small and moderate-sized family farms strengthen the principles of individual freedom and economic opportunity that are essential in a democracy.

Specifically, recognizing that the purpose of the Federal reclamation law, as originally enacted, was, and still is, to foster family farming, we would urge that this Commission, in writing its report, make the following recommendations:

(1) That Federal reclamation law be amended to provide that no money be appropriated for any reclamation project until all excess landowners within the project area have signed recordable contracts to sell off their holdings greater than the acreage provided by law (160 acres for an individual; 320 acres for man and wife).

(2) That Federal reclamation law be amended by establishing within the Treasury of the United States a new and separate revolving fund through which Federal purchase, at preproject prices, and later disposal of excess lands to family farmers can proceed.

(3) That the Department of the Interior be mandated to make studies and develop plans whenever a reclamation project is proposed for the disposition of excess lands for the purpose of family farming. The Department should be encouraged and directed to dovetail its operations in this regard with other interested Federal agencies having similar or complementary goals.

To repeat, the historic purpose of reclamation law was to bring about the establishment of family-sized farms in the arid regions of the West. The history of enforcement, or more appropriately, nonenforcement of this law, indicates that too often this goal has been overlooked. Moreover, recent developments, such as in the Westlands Water District in California, indicate that unless remedial measures are adopted the creation of family farming units may be a dead issue. The California labor movement believes the public interest is paramount and that it runs counter to land speculation and land monopoly. Moreover, the only way the public interest can be protected is through rigid enforcement of reclamation law. For this reason we urge this Commission give serious consideration in its final report to the three recommendations noted above.

Thirdly, besides low pay and the exclusion of farmworkers from the social legislation enacted over the past 30 years, rural poverty is both caused and perpetuated by the fact that large numbers of farmworkers are not employed on a year-round basis. Many of these workers could do some nonfarmwork if the opportunities were present. Part of the reason for this problem lies with the operations of the Farm Placement Service in each State.

As Varden Fuller, professor of agriculture economics at the University of California, Berkeley, pointed out at the 44th Annual National Agricultural Outlook Conference in Washington, D.C. on November 15, 1966, "For almost a quarter of a century, farm placement has been operationally separate from all of the remainder of the Federal-State placement system." While farm placement personnel in the various State agencies have had the responsibility of recruitment of farm labor and their placement, local office personnel characteristically have not been expected or even permitted to help workers arrange combinations of seasonal farm and other jobs within the area where they live, even though such a step might give these workers greater year-round employment. Parenthetically, it seems odd that a nation that has done so much to advance farm technology and farm output per man-hour over the past 20 years (at a greater rate than output per man-hour in any other industry in the nation) has given so little real consideration to its obligations to the people displaced by this advancing technology. However, it is still not too late. What is needed is the desire and intent to build a reasonably stable rural labor force and to develop an orderly set of employment relations for rural workers.

Professor Fuller recommended that the Farm Placement Service be replaced by a Rural Industries Manpower Service. Such a service would have a comprehensive set of duties. Besides the obvious job of recruitment and placement of workers, one of its main tasks could be to help workers arrange and schedule an annual work program composed of farm and nonfarm jobs. In addition it also could help develop training programs to complement these efforts.

The point is simply that a more comprehensive approach to the problems of poverty and employment in rural America is obviously necessary. Professor Fuller outlines what may be a promising approach. We urge that this Commission, in drawing up its final report, seriously consider the possibilities for combating rural poverty that are inherent in such an approach.

Fourthly, the very existence of this Commission attests to the fact that America's forgotten workers—the domestic farmworker and other rural workers—are no longer quite so forgotten. The California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO, fervently hopes that from the work of this Commission the problems of poverty in rural America will receive the attention they deserve and that from this will flow the legislative programs and policies which will help rural workers join the mainstream of American economic life.

I want to thank this Commission for the opportunity to appear here today. Hearings such as this are extremely important to lawmakers, labor, growers, and government officials. Moreover, they also perform valuable educational functions by helping the general public better understand the plight of those who continue to suffer poverty and deprivation in a period of unmatched national prosperity.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Peevey.

Questions first on my right. Are there any questions by any member of the Commission on my right? (No response.)

Are there any questions by any member of the Commission on my left? (No response.)

I guess that attests to your ability of putting forth your ideas, Mr. Peevey.

Mr. GALLEGOS: I have a few questions, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Go right ahead, Mr. Gallegos.

Mr. GALLEGOS: I was very interested in your suggestions for the Federal Government to consider new ways of dealing with the question of or dealing with the problem of the farmworkers and perhaps with Federal legislation or Federal law to cover them by the National Labor Relations Act as other industries are covered.

In the cities, the development laws are frequently used to relocate the urban poor and they are shifted merely to another part of the city or community where available low cost housing may exist or where public housing has been bought to take care of that part of their problems, and they have built high-rise apartments or housing developments to take care of that. The reason for the high-rise apartments is that it takes a smaller amount of land to take care of many more families, and these are set up to revitalize parts of the city.

Now, I am wondering, taking your suggestion of the Federal Government considering ways of setting up a special development to work in much the same way as the redevelopment laws have worked in the cities, whether or not we should not begin to develop a new kind of public program, one to strengthen the farms, in the concern for the retraining and relocation of workers who may be displaced because of the lack of work opportunities and requirement of adult education, and the purpose of using funds to further plans that initially show real promise of using the skills which have been developed by these displaced people.

Has the Federal Government to your knowledge investigated this program at all; or are these just suggestions that you people in your studies have come up with and talked about?

Mr. **PEEVEY**: As I said in my statement, it is our firm belief that Federal reclamation projects, Federal reclamation laws, which came into existence in 1902, were for the purpose, I think, as expressed in the act itself, of fostering the establishment of the small farms. In many, many areas of California, and I suppose in many other parts of the West, they have become nothing but handouts, and I am talking about these reclamation projects, to large corporate growth.

Senator Gaylord Nelson, one of America's foremost conservationists today, in the last session of Congress did offer a bill which would do many of the things which I outlined, including setting up a separate revolving fund within the Department of the Treasury to foster family farming in California and other States where reclamation programs exist.

The great problem here is that the proponents of family farming ran into the great myth that there is no place left for family farming in America today. We reject this out of hand, particularly in California, where 80 acres of grapes or peaches can very well return a net income of $15,000 to $20,000 a year.

Furthermore, we see some parts of California, specifically the western water districts, the west side of the San Joaquin Valley, which at the present time only grows alfalfa—the Federal project going in there on reclamation benefits that area something around a half billion dollars, of which 75 percent of the land owned in this project area is owned by a half dozen landowners—the Southern Pacific Railroad alone out of approximately 500,000 acres owns 120,000 acres, nearly one-fourth of it—in which, I said, there was 75 percent when the program was first put through the Congress, and in the interim, the big growers have continued to get bigger and forced the little guy out and they have bought up all the land under water in this area, in direct contradiction to reclamation law.

The Department of the Interior is well aware of this, but political realities being what they are, this seems to fall on deaf ears.

Mr. **GALLEGOS**: There has been much testimony given to the effects of self-terminating of Public Law 78.

There are some indications that in California there might be efforts to revive the importation program under Public Law 478 or under something like Public Law 414, and then there is some concern about the possibility that there might be an increase in the number of illegal workers who are crossing the border to take the place of others of those who were terminated.

Would you care to comment on this?

Mr. PEEVEY: Well, I would simply point out that in the summer of 1963, the U.S. Congress recognized that Public Law 78 would be terminated on December 31, 1964, and that it would not be continued, and they in reality took this action.

The growers of California were aware for 1½ years prior to that that they were going to have to adjust to this change in the loss of the bracero program, because approximately 100,000 braceros were coming into California in one year, and this of course was beneficial to the grower, because as has been mentioned, it held farm wage rates down on domestic workers.

So they did not want to give it up, and they made quite a display of their feelings at many, many different hearings, and to the U.S. Congress and to the State of California, and to anyone else they could. Their plea throughout this period was that crops would rot in the fields, claiming that the bracero labor was better suited to do this stoop labor work than the domestics because they were built closer to the ground and many other cultural anachronisms and such things as that. Despite their plea and political efforts, in 1965, 97 percent of the farmwork in California was done by domestic farmworkers, compared to 75 percent in previous years.

There was a major increase of domestic farmworkers throughout the California area, and also there was an increase in the gross farm income in California, as pointed out in my testimony.

In 1966, there was a further reduction; there was a very small number of foreign farmworkers entering California. Again, there was another increase in the gross agricultural income in the State of California and a further increase in domestic farmworker employment.

Moreover, the bracero who had been coming into California and making money and taking it back to Mexico was cut off and the money remained in California. Farmworkers in California had more money, and they were spending more money locally throughout the valley, and it was greatly contributing to the economic well-being and sustainability of small communities in the California rural areas.

Despite this fact, it is clear that the growers will never be satisfied with the current setup. They want to go back to the years they had mass importation of foreign farmworkers from abroad. They want this for many, many reasons; the workers were more docile, more pliable, much less active, and much less interested in a farmworkers union; and, they kept wage rates down.

So I think that with the change of administration in Sacramento, there has been a man appointed to the head of the Department of Agriculture in the State of California, and a man appointed to the State Board of Agriculture in the State of California—these men have been all their lives outright proponents of the bracero program.

So I think in this year of 1967, there will be increased demands for foreign farmworkers.

However, I would point out that the final say—so as to whether foreign workers will enter California, or even enter this country, will not rest with the State of California or with any State, but with the Federal Government and with the U.S. Department of Labor.

The CHAIRMAN: Any other questions? (No response.)

Let me ask a question. Do you have in the State of California a minimum wage that would cover the farmworkers?

Mr. PEEVEY: The State of California does not have a statutory minimum wage set by the legislature.

We have a minimum wage for women and minors that is set by what is called the California State Industrial Welfare Commission, and it periodically sets minimum wages for women and minors in a number of occupations in industry, such as manufacturing, personal service, transportation; and, in 1959, agricultural workers were brought under this minimum—women and minors, that is.

The minimum at the present time for farmworkers—women and minors—in the State of California is $1.30 an hour, which is the same minimum as exists for all the other industries for women and minors in the State.

So there is what you might call a comparison between farmworkers and other industries.

At the present time, moreover, the Industrial Welfare Commission provides minimum wage rates in the State of California. There is every indication that there will be another increase in the minimum wage rates for all workers, again including farmworkers, in the State of California.

The CHAIRMAN: Women and minors, however?

Mr. PEEVEY: Women and minors, right.

However, growers find it difficult sometimes to not pay the men what they pay the women; besides, I believe, and I am not an expert on this, but I believe that Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act makes it an offense to discriminate against women and men and other groups.

As a matter of fact, I think it has had the effect of lifting or raising the minimum wages for men. In 1965, the women were at a higher portion of the farmworkers, the farm labor force, than they were 5 years ago in the State of California. This came again, I believe, as a result of the minimum wages for women and minors.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, you were making reference to the equal employment opportunity section of the act of 1964?

Mr. PEEVEY: Right; however, I am not an expert on that, but I believe that is correct.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions by any members of the Commission?

Mr. HENDERSON: As the result of the lack of availability of the braceros to work in the fields, what actually happened to the income of the growers?

Mr. PEEVEY: Much to the growers' surprise in California, they realized a greater income.

Mr. HENDERSON: However, I am talking about their actual experience as to whether their crops were actually harvested?

Mr. PEEVEY: Yes, they were. There were one or two cases which I could mention, if you want an indication, but there were one or two cases in 1965 in which growers maintained that not all crops were harvested. We had a few political developments and a junior Senator from the State of California toured what was considered to be the "crops rotting in the field strawberry patch" type of thing; but despite this, gross farm income increased and there was every indication that there were no crops that rotted in the fields.

Mr. HENDERSON: Thank you.

Mr. GALLEGOS: Mr. Peevey, would you care to comment on the Manpower Development Training Act as applied to the farming areas in California, and whether it has had any effect?

Mr. PEEVEY: Well, specifically, the Manpower Development Training program has not lived up in every case to the hopes of its proponents in the rural areas of California. There was a crash program under the Manpower Development Training program in 1965 because there was a fear of crops rotting. They trained tomato pickers, and this was just the result of a subterfuge and this type of thing.

But I think, looking beyond the immediate kind of problems, that there is great promise and hope through programs like MDTA or an even broader kind of rural manpower type of service program, in order to help farmworkers and other rural workers maximize their employment opportunities.

I think this is where we have to give our consideration as farmworkers become organized in California, and I think they will be organized in the not too distant future, since the movement has been on for the past 2 years. And since this is the very beginning, I think this needs our attention.

But it was not too many years ago that the DiGiorgio Corporation, for example, would have nothing to do with the organization of farmworkers at all, and just last week there was a case of arbitration and there will be collective bargaining given to a majority of the corporation's employees—this is a corporation that has in excess of $30 million a year in business—and this was with the United Farm Workers and would cover all of the farmworkers of the DiGiorgio Company properties throughout the State of California, except in the Maryville operation.

But as these things unfold and wages increase, there will be more mechanization, as indicated by the last speaker. There will be more mechanization, and unless you have a coequal increase in production with the increases in output and increases in demand, you are also going to need, as he pointed out, more man-hours of farm labor.

We have not had this problem in California over the last few years, as the bracero program itself will testify—at least, according to the growers, they have had a labor shortage because of employment increases in California agriculture in the last few years of domestics.

But, looking down the road, someday this problem will occur. It will mean that some workers who are now employed in agriculture will not even have that someday; and I think it is incumbent upon all of us in this room to try to devise programs and strategies which will help these workers to become fully employed, if not in farmwork itself, in supporting jobs that are related to farmwork, perhaps in the form of industrial jobs, because as you know, industrial jobs are moving more and more into farmworker areas.

Mr. GALLEGOS: Thank you.

Mr. PEEVEY: I would most humbly urge the Commission to study quite in depth the kinds of proposals that I have outlined here, because they are problems we are going to have to face; they are realities; and I think it is your business to consider them in your deliberations.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions?

Mr. FISCHER: Did I understand you to say that industrial expansion is taking place, or that industry is expanding into the area of the farmworkers?

Mr. PEEVEY: Well, the pattern has been that in certain parts of the San Joaquin Valley. There has been in the last few years a movement into that area of electronics plants and other things of that nature, motivated quite simply by the desire to hire people for low wages, and because of the lack of trade unions in the area.

But, hopefully, this will change. It is a part of the labor movement's job to make sure this situation does not continue to exist in terms of the wages of these unorganized workers.

I think that—or I hope that we are doing our job in this regard to try to organize and raise the wages of these people. I think that there is a tendency to do this. Los Angeles is, of course, a metropolitan area of 10 million people now; and it is only natural that they try to decentralize to some extent.

Mr. FISCHER: Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Peevey, I think the interest indicated by the members of the Commission should indicate how important we feel it is. Thank you again.

Mr. PEEVEY: Thank you, sir.

The CHAIRMAN: The Commission will now call Tom Martinez, Community Service Organization, from Bakersfield, Calif. (No response.)

Is Mr. Martinez present? (No response.)

Very well, is Carlos Bonales present? (No response.)

All right, we will proceed with the next witness, Mr. Herbert M. Greer. Are you present, Mr. Greer?

Mr. GREER: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I am ready.

The CHAIRMAN: Very well, sir, you may present your testimony at this time.

STATEMENT OF HERBERT M. GREER

Mr. GREER: I am Herbert M. Greer, vice president of Burnell-Nytronics.

The American business community has always been known for its quick ability to spot a good investment.

As members of the investment community, would you invest a net of $125 to receive a return in 4 years of $500,000? And would the investment have more appeal if you were assured of receiving at least another $150,000 to $250,000 annually for the following 20 years?

This is not a hypothetical situation. It is, in fact, a reality.

In the next few minutes allotted to me I shall introduce you to a most dramatic situation.

In 1962, at the electronic show held in Chicago, a Bureau of Indian Affairs official introduced Mr. Norman Burnell to the various programs available to industry which located on Indian reservations. His interest was aroused, and he visited the Pueblo of Laguna, which is located about 40 miles west of the City of Albuquerque, N. Mex., directly on Route 66.

Subsequently, after negotiations, we visited the Pueblo of Laguna and a business contract was entered into between the Pueblo and Burnell & Co., now better known as Burnell-Nytronics. During the year 1963, a building was to be constructed by the Pueblo of Laguna, and a lease for 25 years entered into, which would repay the entire cost of the building together with interest at the rate of 6 per cent annually. Within a period of 3 years thereafter, Burnell would employ 200 persons. Our business was a highly technical one—the manufacture of toroidal filters and transformers for business commercial applications as well as NASA, AEC, and military ones.

In February 1963, after determining the required curriculum, the first group of 40 trainees started their program of vocational education at a vocational institute already established in the City of Albuquerque. The selection of this first group and, by the way, every other group thereafter, was made by the New Mexico State employment office who administered the various tests known as Gate Testings. These students completed their studies within 12 to 17 weeks. We had sent three of our own supervisors in from the East to assist in the training at the vocational institute.

As our building had not been constructed when the first group of students was graduated from their courses as toroidal winders and solder assemblers, we utilized the Pueblo's community hall to start operations in May 1963, with approximately 40 persons.

After completion of the building—a modern concrete structure, air conditioned, about 40,000 square feet—we moved into it in July of 1964. Training courses were thereafter conducted on our premises under the auspices of Albuquerque Technical Vocational Institute under the New Mexico Vocational Education Department, saving traveling time and additional cost to the United States. We now employ 150 persons and will have an additional 60 persons employed within the next 60 days.

More importantly, however, we now have 4 Laguna Indians in executive positions, out of a total of 12 executive positions in the plant. In addition, every foreman now employed has come up from the ranks of workers originally trained.

Let us for a few moments, examine the Laguna situation.

The traditional sources of income were dry and irrigated farming and stockraising. In 1953, the Anaconda Copper Co. discovered uranium on their lands and has since been paying royalties. Unfortunately, there was a sharp and sudden drop in uranium demand in 1962, with the result that there were over 600 persons unemployed. Many of the younger, better educated members decided to leave the Pueblo to seek work elsewhere.

Then under the auspices of the Area Redevelopment Administration, an overall economic development plan was drawn and enthusiastically accepted on October 31, 1962.

While the plant was being constructed, a site for the construction of 10 new homes was also selected, and the ARA stepped in with its part for the construction of roads, water supply, and sewers to serve both the plant and the new modern housing.

During this interval the students were receiving training in electronics under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Vocational Education.

Through this perfect cooperation between Federal and State agencies and private industry, the training program has continued through this day.

I mentioned earlier this excellent investment which was available.

When members of the Pueblo of Laguna entered into the employ of our company; the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs entered into a contract with our firm for an on-the-job training contract. Depending upon the skills, this contract provided that for periods of between 12 and 52 weeks the Bureau would pay one-half of the minimum rate of wage for that period.

The United States, therefore, paid to our company a total of approximately $250,000 for on-the-job training; our company would have been required to pay to the United States Government at least 48 percent as corporate income tax. Therefore, the cost to the United States would be an infinitesimal amount of the total cost.

At this time the payroll generated is at least $500,000 per annum and will increase. This means that on the basis of minimum tax withholding the United States is receiving in taxes at least $125,000 annually. This is an excellent return to our Government on its investment. Any claims, therefore, that our Government is wasteful must be discarded in the nearest rubbish heap.

But more importantly: The regular jobs created have taken people from the relief and welfare rolls into the taxpayer rolls with the concomitants of independence and pride of achievement and a return of cash taxes to both the United States and the State of New Mexico.

For my part, it has truly been a great and uplifting experience which I and my colleagues, who have worked hard alongside of the people of Laguna in creating this industrial plant into a successful one, have relished and enjoyed.

Where communities lack funds to build industrial complexes, sufficient funds and/or credits at low interest rates of 2 percent should be made available in order to assist those communities in the construction of such plants. The vocational training must be utilized to staff such plants and on-the-job training made available, either through down payments or tax credits. Set-asides should be provided in contracts to keep those plants in operation for full employment.

Some of the tax exemption features of Operation Bootstrap, which played such a tremendous part in the industrialization of Puerto Rico, should be emulated for the Indian territories.

I believe also that an intensified study should be made available regarding the teaching of English to students where English is not the primary language spoken. It is my opinion that a thorough study be required, in order to fit the curriculum to meet the needs of our present-day industrial society, and a longer Headstart program instituted.

Mr. **Henderson**: Chairman Laurel is not present right at this moment. However, we have a little problem, Mr. Greer.

This may be inconvenient to you, sir, but we have one person who must catch an airplane, or at least he must leave here about ten minutes past two o'clock.

I wonder if the Commission members would allow Mr. Greer to step aside and hold their questions—I know they do have questions because what Mr. Greer has presented is very important, and we want to give him proper time and the Commission members proper time to discuss the testimony given by Mr. Greer. We do not want to lose the thrust of his testimony.

I think we can do this without losing that thrust, if that is agreeable with everyone.

Mr. **Greer**: That is fine with me, sir.

Mr. **Henderson**: Then I would ask that Mr. Moffatt come forward and present his statement at this time, since he does have an airplane to catch.

Mr. **Greer**: Certainly, Mr. Chairman, I will stay right here and be available.

STATEMENT OF HOWE MOFFATT

Mr. **Moffatt**: My name is Howe Moffatt and I am here representing Utah, Colorado, Arizona, and New Mexico in the Four Corners Economic Development Region. I will speak on "The Characteristics of the Four Corners Region."

The Four Corners Region consists of 91 counties in the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, and Utah. The region comprises 8 percent of the nation's area, but less than 1 percent of the nation's population.

During the 1950's, important changes occurred in the economic structure of the Four Corners Region. A brief summary consists of the following facts: (1) Agriculture declined in relative importance; (2) mining and processing of ores expanded in some parts of the region but declined in others; (3) the construction industry grew as new roads, processing plants, and homes were needed and reclamation projects were authorized; and (4) the trade and services industries expanded more than local growth alone would have warranted, as tourism developed and, especially in New Mexico, as Federal research and development activities mushroomed.

Most of the agricultural employment decreases were due to increased technology and productivity in agriculture—a problem shared by most sections of this vast area. Also, the production of some crops declined, as farmers and farmworkers shifted to higher paying jobs.

The mining and the processing of uranium ores expanded rapidly during the early 1950's but have (temporarily, it is hoped) subsided since. Copper mining remains significant in Arizona, Utah, and New Mexico; and potash—long a very valuable New Mexico resource—is now assuming real significance in Utah.

Another important mineral development during this period was the discovery of petroleum and natural gas in the true Four Corners area, with production concentrated in the northwest corner of New Mexico and the southeastern section of Utah. However, employment in mining has not followed the pattern of increases in production.

The other important development of the 1950's was the substantial increase in tourists, who now visit almost the entire area. While the total number of tourists coming to the region is not available, that of visitors to national parks is. Visits to such units in southern Utah, northern Arizona, and southwestern Colorado increased rapidly in the immediate postwar period. (New Mexico's biggest national park unit, Carlsbad Caverns, lies outside the geographical boundaries of the area herein discussed.) The most marked increases in such visitors have occurred since 1953.

As a result of these basic economic changes in the region (mineral developments, increasing tourism, and burgeoning Federal installations), employment in secondary industries has also expanded.

In summary, it can be stated that the economic base of the Four Corners States (especially of those portions of the States included in this study) has been traditionally agriculture, with livestock raising and the growing of specialized crops the dominant features. Largely because of the marked increase in agricultural productivity, employment opportunities in that industry have declined.

In several counties within the four States, significant mineral developments have occurred during the last 10 or 15 years—first uranium, then petroleum, and now potash. All have enlarged the economic base. Likewise, the defense- and space-oriented activities of the Federal Government have come to occupy a position of major economic importance.

In those counties with developing job opportunities, there has been a net in-migration of people, resulting in sharp population increases. In other counties a net out-migration has been the pattern, with a continuation of the population declines existing since the 1920's.

Now, concerning the area, population, and migration in the Four Corners Region. The Four Corners Region, as considered by this analysis, consists of 91 counties. Of these, 9 are in Arizona; 40 are in Colorado; 21 are in New Mexico; and 21 are in Utah. Total land area of these 91 counties is 289,224 square miles, with a 1960 population density of 6.1 per square mile, in comparison with a national density rate that same year of 50.3. The Four Corners Region comprises 8 percent of the nation's area but slightly less than 1 percent of the nation's population, a fact which emphasizes one of the major problems of the region—that of geographical isolation and sparse population. The population in 1960 was 1,758,693—up by 26 percent from the 1950 figure. This increase compares favorably with a national increase of 19 percent for the 1950-60 period, but the total population remains small.

Statistics for the growth counties (those with 25,000 or more population and a 20 percent or more growth from 1950 to 1960) present interesting contrasts to the statistics for the rest of the region. The counties showing this growth are Coconino and Pinal in Arizona; El Paso, Mesa, and Pueblo in Colorado; Bernalillo, San Juan, and Los Alamos in New Mexico; and Utah County in Utah. Together, they accounted for 48.5 percent of the region's

1960 population, but only 14.1 percent of its land area. Their combined population density was 21 people per square mile, in contrast to 3.6 people for the rest of the region. Higher densities are also evident for the growth centers within each State.

As is obvious, those counties contain the major urban centers of the region. Significantly, they are the areas which have experienced the most rapid population growth (61.9 percent, compared with 3.6 percent for the rest of the region). While natural increase in the outlying portions of this vast section was just barely sufficient to offset losses caused by migration, the expansion of population in the growth counties was considerably aided by a substantial net in-migration. The picture within the area pertaining to the individual States varies somewhat, as the nongrowth counties of two States actually gained population while their counterparts in the other two States lost population. Nevertheless, in all States, only the growth counties gained population through immigration.

Of the total population, 49.6 percent is rural and 50.4 percent is urban. Nationally, the population is about 30 percent rural and 70 percent urban. Colorado and Utah portions of the Four Corners Region are less rural and more urban than are the portions of Arizona and New Mexico, but the Four Corners area as a whole is far less urban and far more rural, comparatively, than is the nation.

The patterns of urbanization being experienced throughout the nation during the decade of 1950 to 1960 were likewise evident in the Four Corners Region but at a more accelerated rate than nationally. Rural population in the region declined 1.8 percent from 1950 to 1960, compared to a minus 0.3 percent nationally. Meanwhile the urban population of the region increased by 60 percent and the national urban population gain was nearly 30 percent.

Though the region's urbanization rate has far exceeded the national rate, the rural farm and rural nonfarm populations of the region remain a substantially larger share, respectively, of the total population of the region than is the case nationally. Over 9 percent of the region's population is rural farm with 40 percent rural nonfarm, compared with 7 percent and 23 percent, respectively, for the same categories nationally.

Now, regarding the employment and unemployment in the Four Corners Region. Civilian employment in the Four Corners counties increased by 23 percent during the 1950-60 decade, a greater growth rate than the 14.5 percent registered by the entire nation. Again, nearly all the expansion occurred in the growth counties, which experienced a 57.2 percent gain. Considered as a whole, employment in the other areas remained virtually unchanged; but actual declines were recorded in the nongrowing areas of Arizona, Colorado, and Utah.

Some significant aspects of the economy are shown in employment by industry group for 1960. In comparison with the national situation, manufacturing is much less important in the region; only in Utah's growth county does the proportion of employment in manufacturing approach the national proportion of 27 percent. On the other hand, agriculture and mining are of more importance in the Four Corners Region than they are in the rest of the nation. Agricultural employment accounted for nearly 10 percent of the total for the region as a whole, higher than the national proportion of 7 percent. While in the New Mexico counties the portion was smaller than it was nationwide, in the Utah counties agricultural employment was a hefty 14 percent of the total. Similarly, mining employment was relatively more important in the region than in the nation. The proportion of employment which occurred in the mining sectors amounted to 6 percent, compared with 1 percent for the nation. Mining employment ranged as high as 12 percent of the total in the Arizona counties. Because employment in mining and agriculture is declining, the impact of such changes will be relatively greater in the Four Corners Region, where initial heavy dependence upon these industries has been traditional. Furthermore, most of the burden of job losses from these sectors will be borne by the nongrowth counties because they are the ones which depend most heavily on mining and agriculture.

Unemployment has been a persistent problem in the Four Corners Region. The unemployed totaled 24,763 in 1950 and by 1960 had risen 9,000. Of course, we would expect some increase with the growth of the population and of the labor force. As a consequence, the unemployment rate was higher in 1960 than in 1950. Notably, the unemployment rate was greater than the nation's in both years (in 1950 the nation's rate was 4.8 percent and the region's was 5.2 percent; in 1950 the nation's rate was 5.1 percent and the region's was 5.7).

The growth counties were responsible for 6,000, or two-thirds, of the increase in the number of unemployed workers, an indication that not all of the migrants to the cities were successful in finding new jobs. Nevertheless, the growth areas were more successful in providing jobs than was the rest of the region; indeed, by 1960 the disparity between unemployment rates in the growth counties and those in the other counties was even greater than it had been in 1950, exceeding the growth-county rate by a full percentage point.

The unemployment rate of 6.2 percent for the nongrowth counties is somewhat deceptive in that it hides the wide variation of unemployment rates experienced throughout the area. Rural areas experienced unemployment rates of 7.3 percent compared to 5.8 percent for urban places in the region, and a 4.9 percent unemployment rate for the rural farm population. In each instance these rates are considerably higher than the corresponding national rates, while some counties had unemployment rates as low as 1 percent, others, such as Rio Arriba and San Miguel in northern New Mexico and Garfield County in Utah, experienced rates as high as 15 percent.

Unemployment rates are only one indication of the employment situation; participation in the labor force is also indicative of the job opportunity situation. The proportion of the population participating in the labor force is exceptionally low for the Four Corners Region, amounting to only 33 percent, compared with 39 percent of the national population. The causes of this situation are various, including cultural traits and the relatively high proportion of people in the younger age groups. Nevertheless, economic opportunity probably also plays a role; in the growth counties, where the job situation was better, labor force participation was also higher. Only in Utah was there no significant difference between the labor force participation in the growth counties and that in the other counties.

Concerning minority groups: The presence of large minority groups is one of the distinguishing characteristics of the Four Corners Region. Persons with Spanish surnames account for some 18 percent of the population of the total region and for as much as 31 percent in the New Mexico portion. Difficulties with the English language and lack of training and of familiarity with urban and industrial life make for high unemployment rates and low incomes for members of this group.

The area also contains a sizable Indian population with a multitude of special and most critical problems. About 7 percent of the entire population is Indian. Some two-thirds of whom live in the nongrowth areas. The unique cultural heritage (in many respects completely "alien" to that of the majority groups) and the strong group ties of these people call for special consideration in any area plan.

Now, concerning federally owned lands. Land ownership by the Federal Government and Indian tribes accounts for 55 percent of the total land area in the four States involved in the Four Corners Region. Such ownership ranges from 72 percent of the total area of Arizona and Utah to 37 percent of Colorado. The ownership of these lands constitutes a unique set of problems as well as an opportunity to integrate land use into development plans.

Now, to discuss the median family income in the Four Corners Region: Data for 1959 indicate that 80 percent of the families in the Four Corners Region live in counties where the median family income is below the national median of $5,625. In 43 counties containing 27 percent of the families of the region, median family income was less than 80 percent of the national median; in 12 counties containing 7 percent of the families, median income was less than 60 percent of the national; and in 4 counties the median was less than half the national figure. (These figures exclude 3 very small counties for which no median income figures were available).

Family income in the Four Corners Region is about 18 percent below that of the nation in 1960, $4,580 compared to $5,625. Also, the proportion of the region's population with incomes of less than $3,000 per year is much higher than for the nation, 30 percent compared to 21 percent. In urban areas within the Four Corners Region, median family income for 1959 was $5,318 compared to $6,166 in urban areas across the nation. Rural areas in the region had family incomes of $4,109, much below the $4,750 for the nation's rural nonfarm families. Rural farm families, on the other hand, in the Four Corners Region had slightly higher family income than their counterparts throughout the nation.

It is notable that only six counties of the Four Corners Region had median family incomes larger than the national median in 1950 and 1960. It is more notable that 74 percent of the region's counties had a greater portion of their families with incomes of under $3,000 than did the nation. There seems to be little question that the Four Corners Region generally is one of substandard income.

Now, as to the educational levels in the Four Corners Region:

On the whole, the region does not appear to have fared as poorly in terms of educational achievement as it did in income.

In 40 percent of the counties of the region, containing 54 percent of the males over 25 years of age, the median educational attainment of the males over 25 exceeded national standards. This situation should improve the chances of success for any planning effort. On the other hand, in some counties the situation is much less favorable. About half of the region's counties have less than 10 years of school completed by males 25 years or older. These counties contained 38 percent of the males in this age category.

Rural farm areas in the region have a lower school years completed than does the urban areas. Rural farm population have completed 9.3 years of school compared to 11.1 years for the urban areas and 10.0 years for the total rural population. These figures are approximately the same as the national figures. Overall, the total population of the region have completed 10.4 years of school whereas the national figure average is 10.6 years.

I would now like to talk about Industry Trends and Changing Technology.

The following sections describe briefly the long-term trends of the dominant industries and the effects of changing industrial technology for the portion of each State that comprises the Four Corners Region.

(A) The economy of the New Mexico counties suggested for inclusion in the Four Corners Economic Development Region has long been dominated by agriculture and mining. While production in neither of these industries as a whole has been subject to long-term decline, in both cases the displacement of workers has been considerable.

In agriculture the number of farms and, as a consequence, the number of self-employed farm operators has declined drastically in recent years: In 1954 the number of farm units amounted to 12,481, but by 1959 the number was only 9,138. More recent data are not yet available but there are indications that this trend has continued. At the same time (1954-59) the number of hired laborers dropped from 11,443 to 9,522. Here, as elsewhere, the cause for the loss of jobs was evidently the introduction of labor-saving technology; for farm income, while always subject to large fluctuations, has shown no sign of a secular decline.

Within the mining sector the largest contributor to the region's output is the oil and gas industry. In terms of production, this industry, also, cannot be said to be in a state of long-term decline; but once again, improved technology has lowered labor requirements. The same may be said of copper, another large contributor to the region's mining production (chiefly through the Kennecott operations in Grant County). The copper situation, however, is further complicated by wide fluctuations in output. Uranium is the one industry which has been subject to an actual decline in production. After reaching a production high of 3.8 million tons of ore mined in 1960 and 1962, output dropped to 1.9 million in 1965. This decline, of course, reduced labor requirements; but the virtual termination of prospecting and development activity was also a contributing factor in lowering employment opportunities.

Primarily as a result of improved technology in both copper and uranium and as a result of the reduction in uranium output, employment in the metals-mining industries of New Mexico (largely confined to the area under review) dropped from 6,400 in 1960 to 4,300 in 1965, or a decline of one-third in 5 years.

One of the most severe economic problems faced by the region cannot be pinpointed in terms of upheaval in a particular industry. This problem is the absence of economic justification for applying modern technology, with its emphasis upon large-scale production methods, to regional industrial operations. This handicap prevents area participation in the advances achieved by many industries elsewhere, particularly those centered in large market areas. Indeed, the real difficulty is not that industries acquired in the past are suffering serious setbacks, but that the area has not managed to establish a solid and healthy economic base.

(B) Utah's portion of the Four Corners Region comprising 20 counties in the southern portion of the State have long depended on agriculture, largely livestock, as a principal industry.

During the decade of the 1950's, important changes occurred in the economic structure of this section of Utah. Briefly summarized: (1) Agriculture declined in relative importance; (2) mining and processing of ores, notably uranium, expanded, particularly in Grand and San Juan Counties, although coal mining in Carbon and Emery Counties declined; (3) as new roads, processing plants, and homes were needed and reclamation projects were authorized, the construction industry grew; and (4) the trade and service industries expanded more than local growth would warrant as tourism in the area developed.

These trends are evident from the employment statistics for the area and from other information sources. For example, the number of people employed in agriculture dropped 44 percent between 1940 and 1960. Instead of furnishing 35 percent of all jobs as in 1950, agricultural employment accounted for only 15 percent of total employment in 1960. Most of this employment decrease was due to increased productivity in agriculture, although production of some crops declined as residents shifted to higher paying jobs. These trends in agriculture, it is believed, have continued until the present.

The mining and processing of uranium ores expanded rapidly during the early fifties and continued through the midfifties and late fifties, only to decline since the beginning of the 1960 decade. While mining employment increased about 130 percent between 1950 and 1960, it has declined during the past 5 years (1959-64). These declines have resulted primarily from the closing of and demolition of uranium processing mills and the continued reduction of coal mining jobs in this part of Utah. The declines would be much more severe had not development of the potash industry in Grand County offset the trend during the last few years. Even so, from 1959 to 1964 the number of mining jobs in the 20 counties of Utah has declined by 29 percent.

The other important mineral development during this period was the discovery of petroleum in the Four Corners area, with production concentrated in the northwest corner of New Mexico and the southeastern corner of Utah. Production in the greater Aneth, Utah, field climbed from nothing in 1955 to 30.5 million barrels in 1960, and natural gas production expanded proportionately. These volumes have, however, subsided since 1960. Overall value of mineral production in Utah's 10 Four Corners Region counties dropped 19 percent from 1960 to 1963.

(C) The area of the nine selected counties in Arizona includes the northern plateau, central mountains, and a low southern desert. The somewhat barren northern plateau is occupied by Indian reservations with national forests, parks, and monuments taking up much of the remainder. The central mountains are fairly rugged. Many parts are heavily mineralized. The central mountains also contain timber and grazing land. The southern desert is relatively low in elevation and dry, with hot summers. There is mining activity in the mountain ranges of the southern desert. Where irrigation is available, crops are grown.

The economy of these selected Arizona counties has traditionally been dominated by agriculture, timber, and mining. These industries have been experiencing long-term declines. Agriculture, which includes forestry and fisheries, has had a decline from 27.7 percent of gainful employment in Arizona in 1920 to 7.6 percent in 1960. Mining employment declined from 11.8 percent in 1920 to 3.2 percent in 1960.

(D) The 40-county area of Colorado under consideration for a Four Corners Region has traditionally been dominated by mining and agriculture. Gold, silver, lead, zinc, and coal dominated the production in the early days of Colorado mining, while in later years uranium, molybdenum, and gas and oil were more dominant. The mining of precious metals was adversely affected by the repeal of laws providing for price supports and by the completion of production of the richer veins leaving lower grade ores and more complex ores still available. The southwestern area of Colorado boomed in the fifties from production of uranium and exploration for gas and oil. The Government purchasing policies for uranium have virtually eliminated employment in uranium production, and gas and oil has now reached a production stage where relatively few people are employed. Coal was produced in much of the area, but this, too, has followed national trends; and most of the mines are now closed or have only very minimal production. Agriculture has followed national trends, with a predominate 60 percent decline in employment over the past 30 years.

The area has been adversely affected by changing technology in terms of mechanization of agriculture and the mechanization of the remaining coal production. The mechanization of agriculture is well known. The only large mining operation in the area is a coke mine owned and operated by the Colorado Fuel and Iron Corporation, and this has been completely modernized. Three of the counties in the area (El Paso, Mesa, and Pueblo) are strong-growth areas and continue to have the potential for development that can assist the economic growth of much of the region. Other counties have not benefited from technological change.

While large parts of the Four Corners area are not directly involved with national defense facilities or production, certain specific areas are being adversely affected by changes in defense policy, and certain other areas are susceptible to adverse effects arising from such changes. Chaves County, with its major city, Roswell, is being adversely affected by the closing of Walker Air

Force Base, which is scheduled to be phased out by 1967. The economies of Los Alamos and Bernalillo Counties are extremely dependent upon defense-oriented industries. All told, the estimate is that the three military bases within the region spent $86.4 million in New Mexico during fiscal 1963, of which $68.2 million went as wages and salaries. Furthermore, the combined expenditures of the regional office of the AEC and its prime contractors for current operations in fiscal 1964 amounted to $196.7 million, of which $141.2 million was wages and salaries. The importance of these expenditures extends beyond the counties in question (Bernalillo, Los Alamos, and Chaves) ; these counties, whose economies are so heavily supported by defense expenditures, represent enclaves of growth in an otherwise largely stagnant region. By absorbing migration from other areas, these counties have, to some extent, been able to ease the burden of economic adjustment elsewhere.

It is evident, then, that a change in defense policies might well have an adverse effect upon the entire region. Under these circumstances, it seems advisable to make an effort toward diversifying the economy, if a stable and an expanding economy is desired for the area. Other areas of the region have not been severely affected by changes in defense facilities or production except as the purchase of uranium may be considered in the national defense since there has been a substantial decline in the mining of uranium and in employment at the Government purchasing facilities in Grand Junction; also, the closing of the processing facilities at Durango and Canon City, Colo., contributed to the employment decline, as did the closing and removal of similar facilities at Monticello and Mexican Hat, Utah.

Next I will discuss some purposes and objectives for the Four Corners Region.

The foregoing data and information illustrate that the vast Four Corners Region of the Southwest United States has experienced historical, cultural, and economic development characteristics that signify it as a relatively homogeneous area with problems common to all four portions of the states of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, and Utah that constitute the region.

The Four Corners Region is faced with problems of heavy outmigration of population, low family income, low educational standards and levels, poor housing, declining emploment trends in basic industries, alleviating underemployment and unemployment of the area's population, disadvantageous geographic isolation and unimproved transportation facilities.

This Four Corners Area is endowed with raw materials and other resources which could be and must be developed in order to overcome these problems. Among these are the following:

(1) The World's Most Colorful Country: Within a radius of approximately 400 miles of the Four Corners point are a minimum of 46 national and State parks, monuments, forests, and recreation areas. Included in these are the new Canyonlands National Park, Grand Canyon, Glen Canyon National Recreation area, Lake Powell, Mesa Verde National Park, Chaco Canyon National Monument, and many others. A major problem inhibiting the exploiting of these natural scenic wonders is inaccessibility due to lack of adequate highway and road systems to these various areas. This area is referred to as the "Golden Circle of Parks."

Most of the scenic attractions would be less than half a day apart if there were adequate access and connecting roads. It is estimated that $60 million are needed for 600 miles of road improvements to provide the service required to make full utilization of this area during the next 10 years.

(2) TOURIST AND RECREATION INDUSTRY: To capitalize on the natural and scenic wonders mentioned under item No. 1, the Four Corners Area needs to develop a system of tourist accommodations—motels, hotels, restaurants, campgrounds, and so forth, to accommodate the millions of tourists and recreationists which are forecast to be visitors to the Four Corners Region during the years to come. This industry, just now in its infancy in the Four Corners Region, offers perhaps one of the region's greatest challenges and opportunities to improve the economic stature of the inhabitants of the region.

(3) EXTENSIVE MINERALS RESOURCES: As already mentioned, many of the counties in the Four Corners Region have long relied on their respective minerals resources as a major part of their economic activity. Nonferrous metals and coal still constitute a large minerals resource in these counties. Others developed more recently, particularly in the 1950's, found new wealth through the discovery of uranium, petroleum, and natural gas, and more recently potash. Mineral commodity maps of the United States Geological Survey indicate known occurrences of titanium, thorium, rare earths, manganese, tungsten, copper, vanadium, gypsum, and anhydrite in either southeastern Utah, western Colorado, northwestern New Mexico, or northern Arizona—the Four Corners Region. Continued exploration, exploitation, and development of markets, and processing industries must be undertaken to realize the potential of these great resources.

(4) INDIAN RESERVATIONS AND SPANISH-AMERICAN CULTURE: Within the Four Corners Region are several Indian reservations and Spanish-American communities. These areas of the region, in particular, need educational, social, cultural, and economic planning assistance in order to realize the potential of these peoples.

In summary, as a result of the chronic conditions of declining employment and underdevelopment in the Four Corners Region the population of the region has not had economic opportunities available in other areas of the nation. These people, generally, are productive and self-reliant but lack the opportunities necessary to develop their full human resource potential.

The four States and local areas of the Four Corners area stand ready to cooperatively participate with the Federal Government in the carrying out of a development program for the Four Corners Region.

It is contemplated that under the Four Corners Regional Development Commission, the plan will be developed which will have as its objectives bringing the average income of the people within this area up to the national average.

I understand that the Commission will consist of the four Governors of the four States involved, together with a Federal cochairman, and each Governor will have an alternate who will serve when the Governor cannot serve.

It has been a pleasure to appear before this Commission.

Mr. HENDERSON: Mr. Moffatt, we certainly do appreciate this presentation, and we do know that you have to get a plane; but would you stay just a few minutes to see if the members of the Commission have any questions?

Mr. MOFFATT: Certainly.

Mr. HENDERSON: I will recognize Mr. Gallegos.

Mr. GALLEGOS: You alluded to the concern regarding the economics of the minority groups in the Southwest.

I am wondering, do you have any Spanish Americans or Negro Americans or Indian Americans on your staff now?

Mr. MOFFATT: We do not have a staff yet. We contemplate having them, however.

Mr. GALLEGOS: Do you have your own staff at this time to put this into operation?

Mr. MOFFATT: We are putting it together with the help of volunteers. The citizens are trying to do something to help us get it together and get it started.

Mr. GALLEGOS: Is this full-time or voluntary?

Mr. MOFFATT: It is strictly voluntary. I am a lawyer by profession.

Mr. GALLEGOS: I see.

Mr. MOFFATT: The Governor asked me to come and make this presentation and I was very happy to do that.

Mr. GALLEGOS: Do you envision that this will be a program which will be done more through free enterprise, or do you intend or plan to go through the agencies of the Federal Government, through the auspices of some Federal Government agency, to implement this? I mean, as to the final plans and the development?

Mr. MOFFATT: Maybe I can best explain our thinking, and our thinking is that it will be this way: The Federal Government and its several agencies owns 55 percent of the land in this area. Now these several agencies have been administering this land for the benefit of all the people.

I think that as the chief landlord in this area, the Federal Government has been remiss in not providing job opportunities for these same people who live in and about this 55 percent of the total land in the area; that is Point No. 1.

Now as to things that can be done. If we get access roads into the national parks, into the recreational areas—and much of the land is recreational in character even though it is not included in a State or Federal park or in the reservation—it will bring private capital in to build hotels, motels, service stations, and the other facilities which the tourist wants while visiting recreational facilities; and those hotels, motels, and service stations and other service industries will provide basic employment for people in the area.

Mr. GALLEGOS: My question is, conceivably the situation could develop where you have American Indians or other minority groups who do own land but do not have the capital to build the motels and hotels when the tourists come in, so that without a program of some Government intervention, for example, through the Economic Development Agency or the Small Business Administration, it could be that you could have lots of new capital coming into the area but the people who live in the State would not be able to avail themselves of any such opportunity or plans.

Now I am not suggesting that you have said this, but what is your opinion?

Mr. **MOFFATT**: We have an indication from the Indian Service that they would like to work with us closely, and in turn, we told them we wanted them to.

Mr. **GALLEGOS**: Thank you, sir.

Mr. **HENDERSON**: All right, Dr. Roessel has a question.

Mr. **ROESSEL**: I would like to ask a question. You mentioned the various ethnic groups that are in this area and you point out that the unemployment in regard to the area is 7.3 percent, and that the Navajo Indian Reservation unemployment is about 10 times that figure. You mentioned that the average income in the area is around $3,500, and the Navajo average income is $670. You mentioned that the average number of school years in the area is 9.3 years, and for the Navajo tribe it is less than 2 years.

Now, getting back to the question that was raised just a few minutes ago. In what way are the Navajo people involved in the plans that you are developing, and in what way do you think they will be involved in the future, because certainly if your area is a needy area, here is a group within this area that are far more needy than the rest.

Mr. **MOFFATT**: The Navajos, as I know them, are good employees; contractors utilize the Navajos when they are building roads; when sanitary systems are being put in for communities, the Navajos are used; when water supplies are being developed, the Navajos are used.

Many of them are skilled in the construction trades and building what would turn out to be hotels and motels for the tourist trade.

Mr. **ROESSEL**: Perhaps you misunderstood me. I understand that they are, or that they will be able to find employment. But I am more concerned in what ways will they be involved in the planning, in making sure that the programs that are developed are in line with their particular requirements and consent?

Mr. **MOFFATT**: I am sure all of the tribes will have to be represented on our staff, in one way or another. I am not in a position to tell you just how at this time.

Mr. **ROESSEL**: Has a proposal been developed?

Mr. **MOFFATT**: No, not yet, it has not moved to that stage yet.

Mr. **ROESSEL**: I see. There has been no proposal developed then?

Mr. **MOFFATT**: No.

Mr. **ROESSEL**: There have been no meetings held between your people with anybody else at all?

Mr. **MOFFATT**: No, we have been in communication with them because they have indicated a sincere interest in this.

Mr. **ROESSEL**: Thank you.

Mr. **HENDERSON**: Do you have another question, Mr. Gallegos?

Mr. **GALLEGOS**: Yes, I do. Have there been communications with other groups about these plans?

Mr. **MOFFATT**: Well, the Governors of the four States have taken it up with the several county commissioners in all of the 91 counties involved. In addition to that, we have contacted all of the Federal agencies which will be involved in this so far as we know.

Mr. **GALLEGOS**: I see.

Mr. **MOFFATT**: It is entirely possible that we may have not been fully advised and that we have missed some of them.

Mr. **Gallegos**: Will you use Federal money to help in the planning and development?

Mr. **Moffatt**: There will be an appropriation of $250,000 for the first year for the purpose of developing a plan; and that can be contingent for a period of 3 years.

When the plan is finished, it will go to the United States Congress for implementation.

Mr. **Gallegos**: Thank you.

Mr. **Henderson**: A question by Mr. Gay.

Mr. **Gay**: What type of reaction have you gotten, or what type of cooperation have you gotten from the various Federal agencies that you have discussed this with?

Mr. **Moffatt**: At this point, everyone wanted to ask questions and nobody knows the answers.

But they have all indicated that they want to participate. We have not found or we have not had an adverse reaction from anyone to date.

Mr. **Gay**: How about on a local level, as far as smaller local political subdivisions are concerned; have you had any infighting or, you know, that type of thing?

Mr. **Moffatt**: Not yet, but I think maybe we can anticipate some of that. It certainly would be unusual if that did not develop. But thus far, there has not been anything of that nature.

Mr. **Gay**: Is the Federal ownership of land getting better? Are they getting more and more land, or are they turning back some of it to the private sector, to private ownership?

Mr. **Moffatt**: It is pretty hard to get any of the Federal land on the State tax rolls.

A very good case could be made for putting some of it on the State tax rolls, but it is very hard to do.

Mr. **Gay**: Thank you.

Mr. **Henderson**: Are there any other questions? (No response.)

There is a gentleman here in the audience who has something to say on this matter. Please identify yourself, sir.

Mr. **Welsh**: I am William Welsh, and the Four Corners Region is what is known as the Regional Section of EDA.

Under that, all of the Indian tribes have been designated as area EDA subdivisions, and here in Arizona, we are attempting to organize under this, some of the States and Indian tribes under EDA.

The Four Corners under this plan should cover the whole thing.

Perhaps I am not being heard too well with the noise from next door. Would you want me to repeat it again?

Mr. **Henderson**: Would you please repeat it very quickly? Mr. Moffatt does have to catch a plane.

Mr. **Welsh**: The Four Corners is a regional program under EDA. Under the EDA, it is also the district which comes within the State.

Now, within the State, all the Indian tribes have been designated as EDA areas, redevelopment areas. They are working on that now. The Bureau of Indian Affairs is working on it and so are the Indian tribes.

In addition to that, some of the counties in Arizona are organizing into districts; but, over and above that, is an umbrella known as the Four Corners Regional District.

Mr. **Henderson**: Thank you very much, Mr. Welsh.

Mr. Moffatt, we certainly do appreciate your coming in and I think we have a copy of your complete presentation.

Mr. **Bonnen**: Could I ask just one question?

Mr. **Henderson**: Yes, I am sorry. Go right ahead.

Mr. **Bonnen**: I have just one question. In developing—in looking at the development of this area, are you going to consider the possibility of developing entirely new communities?

Mr. **Moffatt**: Well, under EDA, as has been pointed out, we had to include what were called the growth counties.

Now, Albuquerque; Colorado Springs; Grand Junction; Utah County in Utah, all of those are growth counties.

The basic problems of unemployment that we are talking about here do not exist in those particular counties; but they are included in the Four Corners Region because it is contemplated that, with the development of this country, that in the strictly rural areas, there will be fewer job opportunities in the future than there have been in the past.

This out-migration from these strictly rural counties should be in with the growth areas in the immediate vicinity; and in these growth areas, it is contemplated that there will have to be developed additional industrial employment to take care of the out-migration from these strictly rural counties.

Mr. **Bonnen**: But, in any case, you have a situation where the rural areas are where your unemployment is so severe. You are quite some distance beyond commuting, regional commuting, in these areas?

Mr. **Moffatt**: As far away as the moon; they will have to move, that is all.

Mr. **Bonnen**: The one alternative to moving them is that there are resources here that could be developed, and we could possibly envision entire new communities. Is that correct?

Mr. **Moffatt**: That is entirely possible.

Mr. **Bonnen**: Is this sort of thing to be considered in the context of the planning of your Commission?

Mr. **Moffatt**: It certainly will be considered, yes.

Mr. **Bonnen**: Thank you.

Mr. **Henderson**: Again, thank you very much, Mr. Moffatt, for your taking the time to be here with us today.

Mr. **Moffatt**: Thank you.

Mr. **Henderson**: I hope you have a good trip home, a good flight back to Utah.

Mr. **Moffatt**: Thank you very much; it has been a pleasure.

Mr. **Henderson**: All right, will Mr. Greer please come back. We appreciate very much your allowing us to hear Mr. Moffatt.

Now, let me share with the audience a little explanation with regard to what has happened.

Mr. Greer is vice president of the Burnell-Nytronics firm in Laguna, N. Mex. He has previously made his presentation and subsequently we interrupted him in order to hear from Mr. Moffatt, who had to catch an airplane. Mr. Greer was very kind to consent to that interruption, and now he is coming back so that we may ask questions and make observations regarding his presentation.

Now, first question by Dr. Roessel.

Mr. **Roessel**: I would like first to comment on your enthusiasm and your ability to relate to us from the heart what you have on a piece of paper.

At least I for one like this sort of presentation because it was certainly easy to follow and it certainly stimulated me just in listening to you.

I would like you to comment, and I think you have very generally already, but I would like for you to be a little more specific, and I would like to get your opinion in regard to some of the statements that are often made concerning Indians; that is, that they are not dependable; that their absenteeism is so great that it is impossible to count on them for permanent-type jobs. Has your company found this to be true at Laguna?

Mr. **Greer**: I might say this. At the very start of our program, we did institute certain definite methods of keeping track of absences. When we explained to each employee that it was an impossibility for his neighbor to be employed constantly unless he was there, we found that the reaction of all of the people was such that absenteeism no longer caused us any problems whatsoever.

However, I will say this, that the absentee rate of the people at Laguna is no greater than the absentee rate we have in Connecticut or in Geneva, N.Y., for instance, or anywhere that we have plants located.

As a matter of fact, we have found that when people understand why absenteeism can be such a terrible threat to industrialization, they will cooperate, and we find this to be absolutely true.

In great part, our absentee rate runs generally at 1½ percent, which we find to be extremely light as compared to all of our other plants.

Mr. **Roessel**: All right, a final question. With regard to the factors which your company took into consideration before they moved West, you often hear that certain incentives are necessary before industry will move; and that oftentimes there is the foreign field where they like to go for certain reasons, in terms of relocating plants.

What are some of the incentives? You mentioned on-the-job training; and I am wondering, are there any other incentives that the Government needs to consider in duplicating your kind of experience?

Mr. **Greer**: I think there are many things that the United States Government should consider. For example, there are many Indian areas and there are many Spanish-American areas throughout the Southwest that do not have funds with which to construct industrial buildings.

It is my private opinion that the United States Government should make available to those communities sufficient credits at fairly low interest rates to make it attractive to industry, because you know that Operation Bootstrap in Puerto Rico started very much this way. They made certain that manufacturers coming into Puerto Rico would buy a building that they would occupy, and they could find people that they could train and who would be trained by the Government as well; and these incentives were made possible by the Government of Puerto Rico.

I cannot see the Government of the United States doing less, very frankly, to insure full employment for the Southwest. I believe it is in the cards to do this.

Puerto Rico also gave tax exemptions, as you know, for a period of 10 years, and other things.

I think also that the United States could do one thing more to insure the growth of small plants throughout this area. With the vast number of Government contracts which are available, if the United States Government insisted upon certain definite set-asides in those contracts to assist the new plants which are being organized throughout the area, I know—I speak with a great deal of authority and knowledge although we did not have such benefits—but I believe that with those benefits set aside in contracts, this would be a great possibility for us here in the Southwest.

Mr. ROESSEL: Thank you.

Mr. FISCHER: I would like to ask a question. Where are your headquarters, and where are your main plants, and is this one located in Laguna, N. Mex., considered to be one of your main plants?

Mr. GREER: Let me say first about the other plants.

We have plants in Geneva, N.Y.; one in Alpha, N.J.; there is one in Kutztown, N.J.; and, we have another one in Phillipsburg, Pa.; there is a plant in Canada; there is a plant in Pelham Manor, N.Y.; and, I believe there is a plant in Watertown, Conn.

Rather than reduce employment, our employment has gone up all around in all of our plants in the last 2 years. We are now contemplating the addition of about 50 more persons in Laguna, N. Mex., which would bring our employment up to about 200 persons in this plant.

We actually are about 40 miles west of Albuquerque, N. Mex., and that is where we do business, and that is where our plant is located.

This is where our offices are. We operate right out of Laguna, and not out of Albuquerque.

Mr. FISCHER: That is your headquarters then?

Mr. GREER: Yes, sir.

Mr. FISCHER: Thank you.

Mr. GALLEGOS: Is your firm a member of Plants of Progress, the national organization which is attempting to increase employment?

Mr. GREER: No.

Mr. GALLEGOS: Because certainly one of their approaches has been to integrate their work force to as high a degree as possible.

Your approach seems to go one step beyond that; you provide and create jobs which means that instead of providing 1 or 2 jobs, you are able to provide 150, which would make much more of an impact in any region of the country.

My question would be, what convinced you to go to Laguna, N. Mex.? You said that someone talked to you initially about this new possibility?

Mr. GREER: Yes.

Mr. GALLEGOS: What really interested you in locating a plant at Laguna?

Mr. GREER: Well, I might just add one thing to what I have said before. Since we have been there, I have had numerous visits from electronic firms, and one that did settle in the Four Corners—

Fairchild—and, as you know, they are employing around 200 people up there.

They visited me, and the questions which you gentlemen have asked and are asking, they asked; and I showed them my records at the time to prove to them that what we are talking about is not just a possibility, but a reality.

I am a great believer in the possibility of getting industrial plants to settle in the Southwest, provided we sell them on the idea that these things can be done; and I believe they can, very frankly. I do not think it is an impossible situation at all.

Mr. GALLEGOS: But again, was this the result of an initial conversation with somebody?

Mr. GREER: Yes, a gentleman from the Bureau of Indian Affairs spoke to the president of our company, and that induced us to come out and see what the possibilities were for a plant out here in the Southwest.

Now, we had been dealing practically only with the people in the East. At this point, we now serve Texas, Arizona, and a number of points in Tucson, such as RCA, and Hughes Aircraft. We hold sold them some of our parts, also.

Also, we have sold people in California. It was much more difficult to do this operating from the East, but this made it relatively easy operating from Laguna, N. Mex., right here in the Southwest.

Mr. GALLEGOS: Do you have a brochure relating to your company?

Mr. GREER: Yes, I do.

Mr. HENDERSON: Could you be sure that we receive one so that it may go in with the record?

Mr. GREER: I will be most happy to do so.

Mr. HENDERSON: All right, thank you.

Now, do you have a question, Mr. Gay?

Mr. GAY: Mr. Greer, you spoke of Operation Bootstrap in Puerto Rico.

I live in the Caribbean; I live on the Island of St. Thomas in the Virgin Islands.

We have the same basic Operation Bootstrap law, tax incentives, and so forth, as they have in Puerto Rico. They have made a successful thing out of theirs; and we have failed miserably. We have flopped so badly that it is just terrible.

I have tried to ascertain for myself why, and every answer came back to local political interference, local bigwigs, and reaching on beyond the local bigwigs, because we are a section that goes into the Department of the Interior, and so on, and so forth.

Have you had any problems with political interference and political pressures to contend with in your area, and if so, how did you discourage or how did you skirt them? Because we failed in the Virgin Islands for that reason.

Mr. GREER: I am not too sure on that. I lived in St. Thomas myself for about a year. I know exactly what you mean.

But it is my frank opinion that as far as the people in any area of concern to us—well, let's take Laguna, N. Mex., for example. They have a government and they have a council.

At the present time, the government and the council are very friendly toward us, which helps a great deal as far as our personal relationship.

Occasionally, they elect a government and a council which is not too friendly, but it still does not change the basic situation, and that is that employment is being provided; and I think this is the basic factor, rather than anything having to do with politics or interference or anything else.

If you run your business correctly and if the local people are employed, I doubt very much that the political interference will make a dent in what you are trying to do; and this goes even for St. Thomas. That is my opinion.

Mr. GAY: Well, I am sorry, I cannot agree with that.

Mr. HENDERSON: I think that Mr. John Woodenlegs wants to say something at this time.

Mr. WOODENLEGS: Mr. Greer, I want to thank your company for including Indians. They do work. They work good.

Now you are speaking of some of these plants being put on reservations or near reservations. Have you tried this in the Northwest, up in the area of Montana?

Mr. GREER: We have not. This is the first one for us; this is the first one we have ever been in. And we are inside the Pueblo Laguna; we are right in the Pueblo, not outside of it. We are located within the confines of Pueblo Laguna.

Mr. WOODENLEGS: Well, Indians will work and they are intelligent.

Mr. GREER: Yes, I agree.

Mr. WOODENLEGS: I have always said there are many people that just will not work, but the Indians will work. I have watched them throughout the country, and I know they work. The Indian people work, my people.

I have seen them work in 35° to 40° below zero weather out in the timber. They pack their lunches. And even in this weather, they will work.

This Southwest territory here is a little warmer than the north country.

Now, there are seven tribes in Montana. We have a plastics factory where they have started Indians. They started, I think, with one Indian, and it has built up to 150 Indians now in this plastics plant there. They make plastic jewelry.

Now that is why I asked if you have ever tried one of these plants in the Northwest on one of the reservations in Wyoming or Montana. The tribes have funds and they may try to develop plants there. They really try to help anybody who comes in and tries to locate there.

Mr. HENDERSON: Thank you. I think we have a question now from Mr. Johnson.

Mr. JOHNSON: How do you base your salaries?

Mr. GREER: We use the base that the Government gives us. It is $1.43 an hour up to $2.17 an hour. We operate this way at this plant.

Mr. HENDERSON: All right, do you have a question, Mr. Bonnen?

Mr. BONNEN: What about your skeleton work force, your supervisory personnel? Are they also from the local area?

Mr. GREER: No, we brought them with us from New York.

Mr. BONNEN: Is there any difficulty which would be faced in locating in a relatively isolated location such as Laguna in terms of utilities or in terms of getting a building for your use or anything of that nature? Did this present any problems in your firm locating where you did?

I am also including such things as transportation and that type of thing. Also, I am interested in your people, the number of people you had to bring with you from New York and what their qualifications were.

Mr. **GREER**: No, this really did not present any problem. We brought with us three men from our plant in New York who started a training program originally. They trained all of the people.

Now, we do drive each morning from Albuquerque to Laguna to get to work. Housing, of course, was not available. So we drive the 40 miles from Albuquerque out to the plant to come to work.

Of course, the Indians who work in our plant are located there.

Mr. **HENDERSON**: Now, gentlemen, we are running out of time and we are running very late on these speakers, on these witnesses, so I would request that you cut your questions as short as possible so that we may try to get back on schedule as much as possible. We are going to be here very late as it is now.

Mr. Greer, I just want to be sure that we do have a copy of your presentation so that we may put it completely in the record. I know that we have interrupted you and I hope it has not been a great inconvenience. We certainly do appreciate your stepping aside for Mr. Moffatt so that he could catch his plane.

Mr. **GREER**: I have left a copy here with you.

Mr. **HENDERSON**: All right, thank you very much.

Mr. **GREER**: Thank you for letting me speak to you, and I hope I have been of some help to you.

Mr. **HENDERSON**: You can be assured that you have.

I will now turn the meeting back to the Chairman, Chairman Laurel.

First, the next witness may be getting ready, and that is Mr. Eloy Chavez.

The **CHAIRMAN**: First, I think we had better recess for just about 2 minutes so that our competition next door may finish their singing.

We will go off the record for a moment.

(Discussion off the record.)

The **CHAIRMAN**: Back on the record.

I believe that our competition has subsided a little bit. I will ask the members of the Commission to please take their respective places now. The Commission will come back to order.

By way of explanation, perhaps I should say that we have been having a little break because of the music from the adjoining room here, and we were about to hear from Mr. Eloy Chavez.

We would appreciate it, Mr. Chavez, if you will just start from the very beginning and present your testimony to us, and I will apologize again for the interruption.

STATEMENT OF ELOY CHAVEZ

Mr. **CHAVEZ**: I am Eloy Chavez, and I appreciate this opportunity to testify at this hearing.

I hope that my feelings and my views on the problems this Commission is faced with help the Commission to formulate a strong and effective program.

I just completed a CAP training program at the University of Wisconsin where there were 52 representatives from 29 States.

There I was able to study and understand rural poverty in its many phases. The most acute problems are those that the migrant faces. He has been living at such a low level of life that the rest of the rural community has also suffered. For this reason, I have elected to speak mostly on the problems of the migrant agricultural worker.

On March 12, 1966, this symposium on migratory workers in Colorado was conducted by the Institute of Behavioral Science at the University of Colorado.

I would like to present for the record this "Symposium on the Migratory Worker in Colorado at the Institute of Behavioral Science Action Research in Socialization Processes held at the University of Colorado on March 12, 1966. First, the agenda for discussion:

No. 1, What are the future prospects for the employment of migratory and other agricultural workers in Colorado?

No. 2, How are the housing and sanitation needs of migratory workers being met? How should the housing and sanitation needs of migratory workers be met?

No. 3, How are the medical needs of migratory workers being met? How should the medical needs of migratory workers be met?

No. 4, How are the children of migrant workers being cared for? How should the children of migrant workers be cared for?

No. 5, How can migrant workers who wish to leave the migrant stream be assisted?

No. 6, What are the problems of the migrant worker and the law?

No. 7, What are the other problems of the migrant worker and his employer?

The matters taken up at that symposium were as follows:

No. 1, The Migrant Farmworker in Colorado—Who is He?
No. 2, Problems of the Migrant Worker related to:
  (A) Education
  (B) Health
  (C) Housing and Sanitation
  (D) Equal Justice Under Law
  (E) Lack of Community Relationships
No. 3, Problems of the Grower:
  (A) The Economic Bind
  (B) Changing Labor Requirements
No. 4, Programs To Meet Problems
No. 5, Some Suggestions for Action
No. 6, Consensus of the Symposium
No. 7, Organization of a Citizens' Council

As to No. 1, The Migrant Farmworker in Colorado—Who is He?

It is difficult to get reliable information on the overall number of workers who come into Colorado for seasonal agricultural employment. Since counts are made at different times during the growing season, the same worker may be counted twice. The State Department of Employment reports that in 1965, the peak period for seasonal agricultural employment in Colorado came in June. Of the 15,000 seasonal workers then employed, about 8,000 came from other States—mainly Oklahoma, Texas, New Mexico, and Arizona—and thus could be called migrant farmworkers in the usual sense of that term.

The most prominent ethnic group is Spanish American. There are also many Indians. A good proportion of both groups speak little English or none at all.

Migrant workers are mainly employed in "stoop labor" in sugarbeets in northeastern and southeastern Colorado; in vegetables, peaches, and other fruits on the western slope; and in potatoes and truck crops in the San Luis Valley. Many follow the crops and thus work in several sections during a season.

Because the work is hard and low paid, it attracts mainly those who are not trained for anything that offers better wages. Moreover, the work is apt to be sporadic, so that the migrant loses time between jobs. Hence, the annual cash income of many migrant farmworkers can be under $1,000 a year.

Complicating this situation is the fact that the entire family often moves with the family head. The mother and older children may work in the fields in order to bring the family income up to the $1,000 level. Family labor requires housing, and housing furnished by the growers or rented by crew leaders is often below commonly accepted standards of health and decency.

The need to furnish housing and to deal with workers who are typically unskilled and often non-English-speaking creates problems for the grower, too. He may be reluctant to lay out sufficient capital to build adequate housing when it will be used a few weeks or months each year. And as the proportion of hand labor diminishes with automation, the number of seasonal workers who have the skills needed to operate machinery appears to be less and less adequate to meet the grower's needs.

As to No. 2, Problems of the Migrant Worker.

The migrant worker faces the problems common to poor people everywhere. But the conditions under which he works create difficulties of a special character. Many of his troubles are rooted in the fact that he does not live in any community very long, and thus the public services available to local citizens are not available to him or are not made available. Education, health, and other welfare services are prime examples.

(A) Education.

Basic to the plight of the migrant farmworker is lack of education which would prepare him for anything but unskilled labor. A recent study of migrant workers in Weld County showed young adults—the young parent generation—with an average educational level of fifth grade; middle-aged adults—the grandparent generation—at third grade and six months; and the old people at first grade. It is obvious that even fifth grade education is not enough to equip a worker to advance in an increasingly technological society.

The really serious consideration here is the children, who stay 6 weeks to 2 months in any one area and thus have almost no opportunity for education in the regular public schools. National data show that more than half the migrant children lag behind other children of their age by one to four school years, and there is no reason to suspect that the situation is any better among Colorado migrant children. Those who grow up with Spanish or some Indian language as their native tongue labor under special handicaps. It is hard enough to shift mental gears to another language in a regular public school system. When the only opportunity for formal teaching is limited to a few weeks or months a year, it is next to impossible.

(B) Health.

Another consequence of constant mobility and lack of education is lack of information on basic health measures. Mothers have very little notion of adequate diet during pregnancy, and for babies, children, or adults, even if cost were no problem. The little money available often goes for the wrong sort of food and for soft drinks. Children are not taught the rudiments of personal cleanliness or care of the teeth.

Unless special programs are set up (see item No. 4), migrants usually do not have access to local well-baby clinics, where mothers could be instructed by public health nurses, where routine immunizations could be given, and where symptoms of disease or disability could be detected. In areas where several thousand migrants come at one time to harvest a crop, an epidemic of measles, whooping cough, or flu can be disastrous to workers and community alike. Both professional services and funds for medicines can be quickly exhausted. Many mentally defective cases are caused by lack of prenatal care or inadequate diet for children in the formative years.

(C) Housing and Sanitation.

It is hard to imagine how anyone, even those with rugged health and some understanding of sanitary principles, could stay well in the housing furnished to many migrant families. Sanitary facilities may be primitive or so badly maintained as to be worse than useless. Where facilities do exist, they may contaminate nearby shallow wells. Water supplies are often nonexistent or water may have to be carried several hundred feet from a common tap or well. Families of 8 or 10 people may be crowded into a space adequate for 2 or 3.

Some growers maintain that it is useless to provide decent housing and indoor plumbing because it will be ruined by careless or vandalistic migrants. Others state just as positively that good housing is appreciated by migrants and brings desirable labor back year after year.

The State health department has the authority to require owners to bring water supplies and sanitation up to minimum standards of health and safety. The department does work with growers during the year to secure adherence to health standards, and in some cases there has been considerable improvement.

It should not be assumed that the housing conditions are uniform throughout the State nor in any one section. Conditions vary from area to area and in some cases from farm to farm. Some housing is above standard.

(D) Equal Justice under Law.

Law enforcement officials vary in their attitudes toward migrant workers. Some say that these people offer few problems for law enforcement, with weekend brawls as the principal offenses. One officer pointed out that this is only to be expected when people work hard 10 or 12 hours a day all week and have no place but the tavern to go on Saturday night and Sunday. Some growers, it is said, expect law enforcement officers to police the departure of crews in order to prevent theft and vandalism.

Attorneys and employers report that migrants sometimes get in trouble because they have been talked into installment buying of automobiles or other things and then cannot meet payments. Attorneys give a considerable amount of free service to migrants. Some feel that the migrant worker's lack of status in the community can result in unequal access to justice.

(E) Lack of Community Relationships.

Throughout the discussion of migrants' problems runs the lack of meaningful relationship with the community in which they are employed. While the "whites only" signs have disappeared from business places in areas where many migrants are employed, less overt discrimination is felt by the workers. It is reported that they are sometimes not accepted by their own ethnic groups in the settled community.

Even where a community makes an effort to welcome workers and their families and to provide services, such provision is usually made outside the framework of regular community services. Thus, workers are apt to feel as if they are a segregated group. Where children are enrolled in the public school system, they benefit greatly from identification with the community.

As to No. 3, Problems of the Grower.

(A) The Economic Bind.

Employers of migrant labor point out that, while wages are low, the level has risen considerably in the past 25 years. Growers in the San Luis Valley paid about $12 a week in 1940 and $60 to $70 a week in 1965.

But the growers are not selling potatoes at 1940 prices. They have cut expenses through automation, through increased acreages, and through packaging and selling their crops directly to the market. Even so, many are going bankrupt. Higher wages, therefore, while admittedly desirable, seem to them out of the question.

A special problem is the provision of housing. No other industry, growers say, has to furnish housing in addition to cash wages. An outlay of $1,000 to keep in repair a house that is used about 3 weeks is not economic. A subsidy for the cost of furnishing houses seems to be the only answer, in the opinion of many growers.

(B) Changing Labor Requirements.

Automation and the advent of complex machinery have changed labor requirements in areas where migrant workers are employed. It is impossible to have a tractor or harvester which costs $12,000 to $14,000 operated by an unskilled hand. But most of the available migrant labor is unskilled. This creates acute problems for growers, who are not equipped to conduct training programs.

Automation will undoubtedly change patterns of agricultural production in Colorado as it has in other areas, with resulting changes in demand for the present type of labor. Cotton, for example, has moved from the Old South to the Southwest, with many unskilled laborers displaced. Sugarbeets and potatoes are moving rapidly to automation. Thus it seems likely that displace-

113 ML

ment of agricultural labor may take place within the State as well as nationally, with resulting social and economic problems.

As to No. 4, Efforts To Meet Migrants' Problems.

Symposium participants described a variety of efforts to deal with the problems of migrants. These programs have been sponsored by State and local Government agencies—often with the aid of Federal funds—by religious groups, and by citizen organizations.

(A) Education.

State and Federal funds have been available in the past few years to provide special summer schools for children of migrant workers in a few areas of Colorado. Along with the three R's, general principles of hygiene and nutrition are included in the program, with toothbrush drill and a shower bath as regular parts of the school day. In 6 or 8 weeks of small classes under specially trained teachers, children have gained 6 months scholastically, a year in general social development. They also gain 3 to 5 pounds in weight.

These summer schools, under the State education department, will be carried on in Colorado as long as needed. The need is expected to diminish before long because Texas—the home base for many migrant families—has established successful intensive school programs for these children which begin in late November and end in May.

Another educational service for migrant children in Colorado is the day care program provided by the State welfare department, using Federal funds. Here children can receive safe care while parents work. Socialization, hygiene, and hot lunches provide for younger children many of the benefits realized by their older brothers and sisters in the summer schools.

The State health department contributes to the schools and day care programs the services of dental hygienist and part-time public health nurses.

(B) Health and Welfare.

In areas where large numbers of migrants work, the State health department provides funds and some services for clinics. Certain county health departments and welfare departments supply funds for public health nurses and medicine. Local physicians contribute their services in the clinics as well as in private practice.

Clinics are most easily set up at migrant camps, like that in Weld County, or where there is a local health department. The State health department supplies the services of public health nurses in some areas which have no organized public health agencies.

Volunteer agencies also help migrants in health and welfare fields. In Mesa County, a feeding service makes meals available to migrants who arrive without enough money to buy food before the first wages are available. In both Mesa and Weld counties, a migrant council provides volunteers to help man the public education, health, and welfare programs and to assist individual families in many practical ways.

In addition to formal religious services, religious groups offer counseling to families and individual migrants in trouble and try to help migrants find ways to help themselves. Both Catholic and

Protestant groups are active in services to migrants in the Weld-Adams County area and have done much to increase community concern for and involvement with migrants. Elsewhere local ministerial alliances cooperate with migrant council programs.

(C) Housing and Sanitation.

Colorado has no law setting standards for migrant housing. However, Colorado does have standards and regulations for "nuisance conditions," which can be applied to migrant housing. The State Board of Health has authority to set standards for water supplies and waste disposal for migrant housing facilities. Inspection and enforcement are carried out by State and county health department sanitarians. Those not complying with these statutes and regulations can be jailed up to 6 months. The department tries to get substandard conditions improved through persuasion and consultation with growers. They also seek to improve conditions in rental housing in the rural towns where migrants sometimes live under conditions which violate every canon of health and decency. Cities and towns where housing is rented to migrants are now beginning to adopt ordinances to require minimum health and safety standards.

While it is often too crowded, the migrant labor camp at Fort Lupton offers clean living quarters and facilities for laundry and bathing. Here, too, are available the health and educational services mentioned in the preceding two sections.

As to No. 5, Some Suggestions for Action.

Symposium participants suggested many approaches to the problems of migrant farmworkers and their employers. While not all of these suggestions can be summarized here, they fall into two major categories. One is concerned with long-range objectives of residence. The other and larger group of suggestions was directed toward more immediate ways of aiding workers and growers.

(A) Long-Range Objectives.

Several speakers suggested that the problems of both workers and growers are rooted in migrancy itself, that the one basic approach to solution of these problems is to eliminate the need for migrant labor. Automation is working toward this end, reducing steadily the demand for hand labor.

To meet the rapidly increasing demand for workers who can operate agricultural machinery, programs should be planned and put into operation as speedily as possible to train migrants with capacity for such work. Federal assistance is available under both the manpower redevelopment and antipoverty programs. But present training opportunities will have to be expanded materially and include basic education for functionally illiterate adults. In addition to meeting a specific farm labor demand, training of this nature could take many workers out of the migrant stream entirely and give them opportunities for work in other industries where such skills are in demand.

Another long-range objective is to make available the basic public services to all citizens, regardless of length of residence in a community. It is widely recognized that migrant workers are ineligible for many health and welfare services because they follow the crops and are thus not residents of any community for very long. Any services they receive are provided by special programs, publicly or privately sponsored. Not so widely recognized is the fact that some Colorado areas where migrants are employed have not yet made provision for basic health and welfare services for their year-round residents. Organization of such services available to everyone, under local responsibility but with help from State and Federal Governments as needed, would eliminate many of the problems of both migrants and communities.

(B) Aid Now for Workers and Employers.

The economic bind in which growers and migrant workers are caught could be relieved, it was suggested, by better utilization of the migrant labor supply. Wartime experience showed that careful planning can result in having labor at hand where and when and in what quantities it is needed. This is not simple to achieve. It requires careful planning and cooperation by growers and by employment services, to say nothing of the workers themselves. But it can be done.

Growers can lessen to a small extent the cost of providing adequate housing by going together to seek low interest loans from the Farmers Home Administration. In areas where many migrants are employed, cooperative central camps might be useful.

The basic economic problem of migrants is due both to low wage levels and to gaps in employment. Bills now in Congress would extend coverage of minimum wage laws to workers employed on large farms and would give them the benefits of unemployment compensation. A guaranteed annual income is now ceasing to be regarded as visionary, as indicated by the recent report of a Presidential Commission including representatives of employers, labor, and the public, and chaired by an economist.

In addition to the training programs mentioned above, the War on Poverty could be useful in helping migrants and other low income rural workers to see how they can help themselves. VISTA volunteers, for example, could be used widely in teaching, in assisting in health programs, and in general community development.

Essential to solution of migrants' problems is recognition of their importance to the communities in which they work and to the production of food for the nation. Communities and individual employers who demonstrate this conviction have earned the loyalty of migrant workers, who return season after season.

As to No. 6, Consensus of the Symposium.

The consensus of the symposium was that something must be done, and done promptly, to meet the problems of migrant workers and their employers. Problems of such magnitude will have to be assisted by the Federal as well as the State Government. But local communities and individual citizens will have to bear in mind their own responsibilities and perhaps assume a cooperative-action role in seeing that problems get the sustained attention that is required.

I might add that just coming to this hearing myself has created quite a few problems for me. Basically, everything was fine, if you can get some money to get here and pay your hotel bill and the expense of travel. It is very easy to say it, but I have 10 kids. What do you do? How do you do these things? I came down here on a shoestring. My plane ticket was paid for.

But, when you decide, what do you do? Is it important enough to come down here and tell all of these people what you feel? Are you able to make them understand what the problems are?

This creates a big problem. For the guy who has the money, it is very simple for him to do it; but for the guy that has to shell out 50 cents for the kid's lunch or go downtown and look for a job, this is quite a problem. A person cannot even attend any of these meetings to tell people what his problems are. He cannot afford to do it.

The CHAIRMAN: Could I interrupt you now, Mr. Chavez?

Mr. CHAVEZ: If you want to ask me some questions, I will try to answer them the best I can.

The CHAIRMAN: Would you tell us first what part of the State you come from so we will have some idea of the region? Where is Aurora, Colo., for example?

Mr. CHAVEZ: It is a suburb of Denver, Colo.

The CHAIRMAN: It is a suburb of Denver. I see.

Mr. CHAVEZ: It is in Adams County, in that area. They have in Adams County, the beet workers and the big sugar companies.

I was going to present what the Labor Department does for the migrant.

In my studies in Wisconsin, I had an opportunity to come back and study our area. I went into the Labor Department and asked them what the situation is with the migrant as far as the Labor Department is concerned.

Well, all they had there at the Labor Department to tell me was that all they do, as far as the Labor Department is concerned, is deal with the sugar companies and go down and get labor to come up. They get paid for this. They come up and they do the work.

The migrant gets up here, the job is not ready for him to go to work, the crops are not ready, and they just sit there, and he is indebted to the grower for half his wages before he even gets to work.

Another condition that was brought to my attention was the fact that in housing, somebody specifies what his wages are; but, in turn, they say, well, you work for $1.40 an hour, and he in turn has to pay out of that 5 cents an hour or 10 cents an hour for housing. By the time he gets his pay, it ends up less than 90 cents an hour. He has no right, nobody has any right, to come into the property to check on this, which is a problem.

He pays a high rent. It is high for housing. He still does not realize the same amount of protection under the law. He is ignorant of the law regarding these things.

The CHAIRMAN: I see. Now, Mr. Chavez, what is your capacity there in Aurora? Do you work for someone, or do you work for yourself?

Mr. CHAVEZ: When I came—well, I haven't worked on a steady basis since I came back from the University of Wisconsin. I have gotten part-time work. Maybe the reason I got to come down here is because of the fact that I have been bugging Washington on this migrant program, and every place they have had a meeting on Headstart or a conference of any type, I come in to ask, "What are you doing for the migrant? Where can I get some help? Where do you apply pressure? What do you do?"

The CHAIRMAN: Are you working for the migrant program there in Aurora, Colo., or are you working an area bigger than that; just what is the situation?

Mr. CHAVEZ: Mainly Adams County.

The CHAIRMAN: Are you a paid employee?

Mr. CHAVEZ: No, not at present.

The CHAIRMAN: You are unemployed at the present time, is that correct?

Mr. CHAVEZ: That is right.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, this training that you took in Wisconsin —of what did that consist? Just give us an idea. Was it more or less along the lines of the work that you want to do among the migrant people, is that more or less what it is?

Mr. CHAVEZ: Correct; but, not only migrant, but social work.

I was on the advisory board in Adams County on rural poverty. I was on the personnel committee. Yet they got a grant and stipulated how many Mexican Americans would be on there, and where they would be located, and how they needed help. To get this loan, they presented all of these statistics. Yet when we were confronted with picking a man for the job of director, the cards were stacked against us to get a Spanish American or Mexican American for director.

The people on the board were supposed to be representing the board, yet I had to fight tooth and nail to get them to consider a Spanish American for the job. I accomplished this, but not without making a few heads split.

The CHAIRMAN: Let me ask you this question: Is there any program being undertaken by the War On Poverty or the community action program, however you denominate it there, that is geared to the needs of the migrant worker? For example, as they relate to health, and as they relate to education?

As you know, some of these people are just going into the migrant labor stream in the different parts of the country, and they go into these areas for certain parts of the year and then they do not come back.

Then we are faced with another problem. What are we going to do with the kids that have lost this much school?

Now, on a local basis, is any attempt being made, or rather, has any attempt been made to take care of problems of that type?

Mr. CHAVEZ: Headstart has come into the picture, for example. We have had a good response from Headstart, from the Headstart program.

But again, you meet the problem of the rest of the family. There is the problem of getting Headstart into the rural areas.

We have hired people to do these things. But yet, there are so many more who would like to have it, who would like to participate.

Then we come up with the problem of getting the old man a job to better his condition and getting his kids in high school, and these things don't develop.

The CHAIRMAN: Now do you have any program, for example, on adult education in the evenings there?

Mr. CHAVEZ: MDTA is about the only thing that they have come up with. Even then, by the time—even if he does take the test and passes, there is no backup; there is no way to get him a position.

We have had a mechanic looking for a job; we have put him through the mill trying to get him situated. By the time he goes to the employment agency, by that time, he is whipped before he starts. He is not able to communicate as far as knowing where he is going; well, he knows it, but yet to get a job is rough.

The CHAIRMAN: Now let me ask you this question: Is an attempt being made to break the cycle of this need or desire to get into the migrant stream from the standpoint of retraining for other jobs that possibly they could fill in the community rather than undertake to hit the road in search of jobs, for example, once a year or twice a year. Do you have any such things?

Mr. CHAVEZ: Well, in the urban area, in the city of Denver, they have all of these programs. But to fit him into them is practically impossible. He is not able to function within the framework and the setup and the specifications that he has to meet.

The CHAIRMAN: Do you feel that all of these things that are being done in Denver, do you feel that maybe the adjacent areas—what might be termed "rural areas"—do you feel they are possibly being left behind? Is that part of the problem?

Mr. CHAVEZ: They are way behind. There is no place where you can go, actually.

The CHAIRMAN: I see.

Mr. CHAVEZ: This education ends up for the educated. They want to study, they want to find out how they can help him. They want to tell him what he needs.

They don't know what his problems are or where his difficulties lie. They study, this is what we need to do—this is what you have got to have—these are your problems.

But he is not considered as an individual, and he is not taught how he can eliminate his own problems.

The CHAIRMAN: All right, questions on my right. I will recognize Mr. Neil Davis.

Mr. NEIL DAVIS: Mr. Chavez, are you saying that in your experience, the people, the professionals or managers of these programs, are you saying that none of them have been poor, they don't have any firsthand knowledge of some of the things you have been laying out here? Is it ignorance on their part or what is it?

Mr. CHAVEZ: This is correct. Even though they know and study and tell you how this has come about and what the problems are, yet when it comes actually to solve them, they are pushing their ideas onto what they need and what they have to have. There is no communication as far as what his immediate needs are, such as a job. They do not even care where his interests lie.

When it comes to the migrants from Texas, Arizona, and New Mexico—when I first heard about this program, this Statewide program is fine. This might be able to cover it.

But, as I look into it, I feel that it is here at the professional end, and it is going to have a hard time getting down to the migrant.

When you say professional in this category, in my estimation, he is a professional, the migrant is a professional. He is the one who knows what his problems are.

You take my case, for example. I went to the first grade at about six different schools before I got out of the first grade because of the school trend. My wife had typhoid fever from bad water, and so forth; and my neighbors and friends—well, not neighbors exactly—but friends that I know have suffered. Four years ago, they suffered the same conditions that exist right now.

The CHAIRMAN: Any other questions?

Mr. LAWRENCE DAVIS: I have a question.

The CHAIRMAN: Go right ahead, Dr. Davis.

Mr. LAWRENCE DAVIS: I think I am going to repeat in one instance what has already been said here.

It seems to me that you are saying that there is a lack of involvement of the migrant worker or the economically disadvantaged person in determining what his problems are; and even if the professionals are correct, that there would be great value in having the migrant himself say, "This is my problem. This is what I believe is the answer to my problem."

Is that stating it fairly?

Mr. CHAVEZ: Yes, this is what I feel is the problem.

Mr. LAWRENCE DAVIS: All right, it seems to me that you stated this also, and I want to be correct with my inferences.

It seems to me that you are also saying that the established agencies of service are either so situated or that they have such attitudes that a migrant cannot get the benefits that he should derive from them, such as your welfare, and agencies of that type; so the economically depressed and disadvantaged cannot even get to the agencies to communicate his problems. Even after arriving there, he cannot communicate his problems.

And, secondly, you said that the new programs such as provided under the Economic Opportunity Act are involved in getting people big jobs, and most of the money is taken off the top, and the migrant worker and others who should benefit in certain areas of the country are not getting the benefits of those programs. Is that correct?

Mr. CHAVEZ: That is correct. In our study of this thing in Wisconsin and Minnesota and Iowa, in one instance they had a public relations man as a director of the program, the program being Migrants, Incorporated. From my information, he was a public relations man for the War on Poverty, not for the migrant, and he was not interested in the migrant or anybody connected with them.

They did not understand and they didn't know about us. They had no idea of where to go or how to go or what to do.

Mr. LAWRENCE DAVIS: Thank you.

Mr. NEIL DAVIS: Out of your experience, you found a number of people who needed help, you found them basically suspicious of the people who are administering the program. You mentioned someone riding around with the deputy sheriff who had papers to serve. I suppose this was for some indebtedness or something like that.

Mr. CHAVEZ: Yes.

Mr. NEIL DAVIS: Have you ever talked to any of the people in the poverty program, anywhere in this area, about this sort of thing?

Mr. CHAVEZ: This is a fact. In trying to get answers, even from Kansas City, which is the regional office, they say that it is geared from Washington, that all these programs come from Washington.

Yet one of the men that came down to a meeting on this proposal that was submitted—and here we had priests, we had people from education, people from all kinds of places, all kinds of representatives of the poor.

The only disadvantage, you might say, or where they had any connection in the migrant area, those of us who had such a connection were I myself and another guy. This guy had come up from Texas. He had been able to buy machinery and go to work. He was able to use this machinery, and he bought this machinery, he got the money from somewhere.

His main concern was the fact that somebody had helped him, and yet in turn his job was over and his machine was laid up. He went to get a job, and he was able to get a job with connections.

The guy who had this job before him had been on the job 7 years and the pressure that they used to eliminate this guy— This guy had to quit his job because they put somebody ahead of him, somebody pushed this man into the position and he realized this. This man had been doing this job for 7 years—well, he quit, or he got out of it anyway. It was just the way they went about it.

The CHAIRMAN: Any other questions?

Mr. GALLEGOS: I have a question.

The CHAIRMAN: Go right ahead.

Mr. GALLEGOS: You talked about the problems of the different standards which make it difficult for different people to take advantage of job opportunities, the problem of agencies setting up a traditional way in which you get into those jobs.

How much of this difficulty of getting a job is because of race, nationality, the discrimination against certain people, not only the matter of qualifications? How much of it would you say, how much of it would you attribute to discrimination?

Now, secondly, you touched on another problem, and that was the fact that there are training programs, such as these CAP training programs, and MDTA, where at the end of the training there is no job. Is this the kind of thing that seems to be going on?

I really have two questions there to answer, and I will repeat them again.

The third area is the question of the migrants themselves, the question of unionization.

Is any effort being made in Colorado by the farmers themselves to unionize, to try and arrive at a better wage scale and contract?

I realize the migrant may work within the State or he may go out of the State; so let me ask this:

No. 1, would you comment on the question of discrimination; secondly, the question of the job market after training; and, thirdly, the things, the kinds of things, that migrants might do themselves, or at least what you can see that ought to be done?

Mr. CHAVEZ: Well, the first one, I feel that discrimination is there. How to put the finger on it or the way to solve it is a problem.

If you say that you just discriminated because you are dark, or you are not very neat, or you are not able to fit within the framework of what the job is or what is necessary, this is the problem.

He doesn't himself know actually a lot of the time what discrimination is. They tell him this is rules and regulations, and this is what you have to do, and this itself is discrimination to him because he doesn't understand these problems.

Now, what was the second one?

Mr. GALLEGOS: The question of a training program without a job being there after the training is over.

Mr. CHAVEZ: Yes, this is a very disturbing factor. They organize communities, everybody gets all hepped up of what they can do for him and how they are going to help him, what his troubles are; and this is what you have to do; and now if you do this, we will do this; you take this training.

Yet when he comes up to finding a job, it is not there. These jobs should be created.

Another little facet of it is he goes and wants some training. He wants the training based on his abilities and what he thinks he wants. They make a survey and tell him, "Well, we have too many in this class right now. Why don't you take this other class over here? You might be able to get a job."

He is inadequate, he does not feel secure in doing it, he don't know what the hell they are talking about usually; and then, even if he gets a chance to take the course—he takes it because it might be a chance so that he can have some extra money—he still isn't getting what he wants, what he needs.

Mr. GALLEGOS: What about the efforts of the migrant workers to organize a union?

Mr. CHAVEZ: This effort has been created and I will have to take my hat off to some of the educated and technical people for this. They have stimulated this, they have been able to create this kind of thinking on what he needs, and how to go about it.

Yet when it comes down to such things as, well, such as this program, to get him to benefit from it, it ends up on the other side of the fence; they are the ones who have the easy way of it. They are the ones who come up with the jobs.

It is as simple as that.

Mr. GALLAGOS: Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: With reference to the second question—excuse me, did I interrupt anyone?

Mr. GALLEGOS: No, you did not.

The CHAIRMAN: All right.

The second aspect, as to that—in other words, what you are trying to tell us is that they go out and make a survey. They find out that they need more cooks than they need mechanics; or that there is a surplus of mechanics, and then they try to train someone as a cook. Is that what you are telling us?

Mr. CHAVEZ: This is exactly right.

The CHAIRMAN: Well, we used to experience that in the Army.

Mr. CHAVEZ: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: At least I did.

Mr. CHAVEZ: Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN: Is that more or less what you are trying to say? In other words, we need secretaries, for example. If there are enough young ladies available, then of course let's go ahead and train them to be secretaries.

What are you proposing along those lines? For example, you made a statement there that I just do not quite understand in what context you meant it.

Let's create jobs, I think you said. Let us say there is an oversupply of a certain trade. How can that be achieved? How can we open up within that particular trade if there is an overabundance of labor supply in that particular one?

Mr. CHAVEZ: Well, I don't think that I qualify completely in solving the problems. The main idea that I want to leave here is the fact that if there are jobs, regardles of what they are, if there are jobs and he can get a job in the first place, then he will be able to do some of these other things.

But without a job, these things of training and so forth leave him cold, because invariably they do all these things and yet they still are unemployed.

The **CHAIRMAN**: Well, what I had reference to—for example, I know a lot of people, let us say even among the migrants, and I am talking about personal reference, and of course maybe I should not be using it here, but I think it is very appropriate.

Now you have a lot of migrants that, through the Nelson amendment, are getting special training to be welders, to be carpenters, to be electricians, and so on, and this turned out to be real fine. This turned out to be real nice.

Maybe a lot of these people just do not like to be migrants, so all they need is an equal opportunity—excuse me—all they need is an opportunity to at least have the type of a job that will give them some sense of security.

Let us say that they have a special mechanical aptitude, and I know that they can very easily put it to good use with the training, proper training and supervision, and that is the reason I asked you that question.

Mr. **CHAVEZ**: Well, even in that light, the aptitude test creates a big bottleneck for him. This creates a tremendous problem for him because of the way his makeup is. They feel that they are going to study him; and he feels that they want all of this information and that it is a waste of time, because he has been this route time and time again. All he is interested in is a job, and here they are going to tell him, "We need to have this, you need to tell us this, tell us how good you are on this," and this discourages him in the first place.

The **CHAIRMAN**: I see.

Mr. Gibson, did you have a question?

Mr. **GIBSON**: Yes, I do have a question. I would like to get a little better picture of the physical situation that you are referring to. I understand that what you have been saying is in the vicinity of Denver, and did you say that it was Adams County?

Mr. **CHAVEZ**: Right.

Mr. **GIBSON**: Is Denver in Adams County?

Mr. **CHAVEZ**: No, Denver is a city that is located in the County of Denver. It is the City and County of Denver.

There are five counties around it, which is called a "doughnut," more or less. But each one of these counties has difficulty because of the rural people involved.

Just a couple of days ago, we attended a meeting where they were trying to set up a community center in a little back area. There is no concern there for a community center, and there is no community action there at all. Everybody goes into Denver. They spend their money on recreation. If they have a car, everybody goes in their car into Denver to spend their money.

These people wonder what to do with their kids. They go and get somebody to buy some beer or some whiskey, and they are away from the community and nobody knows where they are at. They get into trouble; they end up in jail. And it all boils down to one thing: the rural area has no facilities for maintaining their own economy.

Mr. GIBSON: Now, this population of migrants—are they, in the traditional sense of the word, migrants? Do they literally travel abroad, or just in the area of Adams County or within the five-county area, in order to work with crops during different parts of the year; or are they more less less stationary as we have been hearing about the groups in Arizona, these people in the camps here in Arizona, which are more or less stationary groups and seasonal workers as opposed to migrant workers?

Mr. CHAVEZ: Well, the employment report of 1965, the peak period of the seasonal agricultural worker employed in Colorado was 15,000 seasonal workers. For this employment, about 8,000 came from other States. So the rest of them are not interstate migrants, they are intrastate, within the State.

So we are talking about 7,000 people—that is the group which is the Colorado group.

Mr. GIBSON: That is the Colorado group that you are referring to chiefly, is that correct?

Mr. CHAVEZ: Yes. But in specifying who they are and where they are at and why, nobody seems to be able to figure out what the problem is. They either go on welfare, or they go into the city into the slums and wait for the next season.

I have a particular—I was born in Wagon Mound, N. Mex. Like I say, I went to the first grade for 2 years.

I think the reason I never came back to New Mexico was because my parents didn't make enough money to take me back, or for us to come back. We stayed there and some of my relatives are still in that same kind of condition.

Mr. GIBSON: Now the area you were describing—is that Adams County?

Mr. CHAVEZ: That is right.

Mr. GIBSON: Is there a community action program in Adams County?

Mr. CHAVEZ: This is the one I was speaking of where I was on the advisory board.

Mr. GIBSON: Now the composition of the population of the county would be migrants and nonmigrants, is that right?

Mr. CHAVEZ: Right.

Mr. GIBSON: About how many migrants would you say there are in Adams County?

Mr. CHAVEZ: I would have to guess. Well, I would say 3,000.

Mr. GIBSON: About 3,000 out of a total of how many?

Mr. CHAVEZ: Oh, it should be about 60,000.

Mr. GIBSON: And you would say there are not enough programs, or perhaps you said there were not any programs, which are specifically giving the kinds of services which this group of migrants need. Is that correct?

Mr. CHAVEZ: That is correct. Say a person who works in an agricultural area during the season, he lives in Brighton or in the Barr Lake area, a little suburb outside, an unincorporated area. He is able to get a job occasionally, and he is not able to maintain a family on that.

Mr. GIBSON: Now are the people who work for the community action program, are there any migrants or people from the migrant families or from the families of seasonal workers on the staff in any capacity—day care or in any capacity?

Mr. CHAVEZ: Well, in the Headstart program, there is one of them.

Mr. GIBSON: One?

Mr. CHAVEZ: What I mean, this is one of the places where they have been able to do this.

Mr. GIBSON: I see.

Mr. CHAVEZ: They have been able to get the people in there. But the problem lies there in that they don't—there is not enough of it. Let us say in one center, we have 20 kids. They need one for about 90 kids. There is no money available.

Those people are stimulated into believing that somebody is going to do something for them. They are still very disgusted and disgruntled.

Mr. GIBSON: How many would you say—what percentage of the migrants in Adams County consider this their home base or are registered voters?

Mr. CHAVEZ: A very small percent.

Mr. GIBSON: What—why would you say that? I mean, how do you account for that?

Mr. CHAVEZ: They have no interest. As a matter of fact, to get down to vote would be a hardship on them.

Mr. GIBSON: You mean, the transportation involved?

Mr. CHAVEZ: Yes, any phase that is necessary for him to do these things.

Mr. GIBSON: Is there any feeling on the part of the population of migrant workers that they could have any political muscle in their county?

Mr. CHAVEZ: It is very definite. In the Brighton area, they have Mr. Montoya, who is a councilman. Yet when another organization, a branch of an organization which is operating in Denver or in other vicinities, when it gets a little strong, that creates a hardship when they come up to the area of that type, because of the political implication that they might have on what is already set up.

As a matter of fact, this is what divides them, because they feel if you follow this new angle that the ones that are in there might lose out, that it might change things, that it might have an implication of overthrowing the power that is involved.

Mr. GIBSON: Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Do you have a question, Mr. Fischer?

Mr. FISCHER: Yes, I have question. If you are going to change the situation, you have to have some conflict in politics to do this, do you not?

Mr. CHAVEZ: That is correct. But in my opinion, the initial organization of it is what is wrong.

It is just like a school system. You try to change part of the school system; you present a problem, and they can't solve it.

You can't buck that big a monster, not by youself or the whole community involved, because they have been entrenched for so long that their ideas and their traditional way of doing things leaves this poor guy out. He has no way. No matter how much political muscle he gets or uses, he is still not able to overcome these traditional political setups.

Mr. GIBSON: Would you say this is the prevailing attitude among the Spanish-American people, the Spanish-speaking people, in the area you are discussing, that it is just sort of useless to try to get the impact on that established order of things, that they just simply cannot expect this sort of political leverage, cannot expect to ever wield this sort of political power?

Mr. CHAVEZ: Well, this happens. If you get a good spokesman, a good organizer, this man has got some push.

They, in turn, themselves pat him on the back and take him out of this kind of situation by their economical power, and they put him in a position where he is not able to disturb them. This I find is mainly—I will cite a particular incident; maybe you have heard about it: That strike in Wisconsin. I was there at the time. What I analyzed from it was the fact that this man was organizing, pushing for it, and he was a student at the University of Wisconsin; he was a college student. When he got big and had enough power behind him, they kind of shifted the rug out from under him. They told him—I don't know whether they told him—but the way I got it from them was the fact that—the statement was that it was poorly planned, poorly organized, it was the wrong time, and that they were going to discontinue it.

To my way of thinking, somebody got to him, because he agreed with this.

He was on a scholarship from some college or something, and this is what I gathered from that situation. He had the people marching, 400 of them or so. And this creates a very bad condition when this happens to the guy who got on his high horse and went marching. He ended up at the bottom of the totem pole. He got no reaction and no backing for anything that he done.

Mr. GIBSON: Are you working in any organizational efforts, or are you involved—or are there persons who are paid or not paid working to organize and to unify groups of Spanish-speaking people in this area?

Mr. CHAVEZ: A peculiar incident happened when it came to pick a director for this $640,000 grant.

People that were being considered in some aspect were people that had organized these groups to better the Spanish people and the other people involved.

But they themselves didn't let anybody else know about it. They had been approached by whoever had set this up, and yet they did not communicate with the rest of the community, the rest of the Spanish people anywhere else in the State. It was proposed to them on the basis of the idea that we want you and this is it.

This was conveyed to the rest of the organizations for their action and consideration of who is the best guy, who is the most good. This is the process—well, until I found out about it. And when I found out about it, I went to each one of these organizations and I told them, "This job is open."

I was considered after I raised a lot of hell; but I wasn't considered until I raised all this hell, and I was, after it was all over, the only one considered because I had raised hell in Washington and told a few people what was going on.

But, there again, in the community itself, these people who get this money, they end up running the show. I called different people who were supposed to be on the boards and supposed to be on the in, and they did not know a thing about it. They would say that you have to see this guy, and this guy, and this head, and so on.

For instance, the dean of Law School at Denver is the chairman of it. This, to me, was done too close. Nobody knew what was going on. They knew they had the bull by the horns and they were going to do it a certain way.

The point that I made, what I told them, was that I didn't think the program could work under these conditions because of the setup.

The peculiar thing was that the program had secondary education included in this. When you write a proposal, as far as I understand it, if a lawyer, the dean of the Law School, left a thing like that go into it and they had to alleviate it, I couldn't see the connection of where or why this type of thing was done. It was not a small project. It was close to $300,000, I believe, and this was in another area, and yet they were trying to include it in the migrant program.

As I see this proposal in my mind, it is very doubtful whether it will ever get to the migrant.

The CHAIRMAN: Have you a copy of the proposals here, or the proposal here, Mr. Chavez?

Mr. CHAVEZ: Not a proposal, all I have is the symposium.

The CHAIRMAN: All right. That symposium is what you have spoken on today, is that right, what you have spoken from? That is the paper that you want to leave behind, is it not?

Mr. CHAVEZ: Well, the symposium and just my letter probably.

The CHAIRMAN: All right, fine.

Mr. CHAVEZ: Like I was stating a while ago, to come into this thing really created a hardship on me. I had to borrow some money from my son for limousine service. I can do that. But you take that migrant out there, what the heck can he do? Where does he go? How can he do these things?

I have taken migrants myself, not migrants, but very economically poor persons, and tried to channel them to different areas. I have had a lot of success in a lot of cases, and in some cases I have fell flat on my face.

As a matter of fact, I know as far as discrimination is concerned in buying housing—I know a guy that is a friend of mine that lived in a one-room shack. He had a good job, he worked for the water company, and he had a good income and everything. But we tried to get him into this housing project. He tried to stand the gaff of getting out of that one-room shack—he had the money, he had the opportunity, he could swing the loan.

A particular case is my son, for instance——

The CHAIRMAN: Well, let me interrupt you for a moment.

Dr. Davis, do you have a question?

Mr. LAWRENCE DAVIS: Yes, I do have a question. In light of what you have said about the complex problems, relating it specifically to the migrants, do you feel that it is possible and do you think that the big objective would be to try to develop a sort of economy that would eliminate the migrant worker and make him a permanent resident of some area, where you would not have to bring in migrant workers and you could have a balanced economy, an area where he could live on what he makes by working on the seasonal crops.

It seems to me that the way you have discussed this, you have an almost impossible problem to correct.

The CHAIRMAN: That is the reason I wanted you to leave behind some of these ideas that you have set forth because they are very unique, particularly to that area you are speakin gabout. We are very much interested in that; and we also realize it is a hardship for you to get over here. We doubly appreciate the fact that you have come to talk to us today.

Mr. CHAVEZ: Well, I don't want any sympathy or anything.

But getting back to this question, this is the problem itself. They don't cater to his economic level or what or where he spends his money. They don't care about that. They don't care how they educate him.

This doesn't have any bearing on the community itself. But this can give him political stature, if he is able to get and maintain a job, and if he is able to keep moving within the rural area itself.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Chavez.

Mr. CHAVEZ: Some of my presentation is not quite as good as some of the others, but I feel very strongly about this. Whether you will be able to do anything about it or not, I don't know; but this is my feelings, this is the way I see the problems.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Chavez. We appreciate your coming here to talk to us today.

Mr. CHAVEZ: Thank you, I appreciate the opportunity to be here.

The CHAIRMAN: The Commission will now recognize Ronnie Lupe of the Fort Apache Reservation, Whiteriver, Ariz.

STATEMENT OF RONNIE LUPE

Mr. LUPE: Members of the Commission, ladies and gentlemen, it is certainly a privilege and honor to appear before you today.

My name is Ronnie Lupe, chairman of the White Mountain Apache Tribe, Fort Apache Indian Reservation.

I know that through the efforts of this Commission, utilizing the knowledge you gain in these hearings, a more unified and direct effort will be made to alleviate the poverty conditions existing on our Indian reservations and in other rural areas.

My remarks must be, of course, directed towards the poverty problems that exist on the White Mountain Apache Reservation. We all know that poverty is more often the rule rather than the exception with Indian areas and that other tribes are faced with similar problems. However, I speak with authority only with regards to mine.

I am also sure you know that the majority of the people living on our reservation, as most other Indian groups, exist in a rural atmosphere. Where we have small towns on the reservation, we do have some problems similar to those found in urban areas, but—for the main part—we must be concerned with the chronic ailments of unemployment, low income, poor education, substandard housing, and all of the other ills and evils commonly associated with "pockets of poverty" elsewhere in the nation.

Sitting in this comfortable room—in this beautiful hotel—in this modern year of 1967, it is no doubt difficult for you to imagine the contrast between life here and in the little community of Cibecue, a rural settlement less than 4 hours' drive from Tucson.

Imagine, if you will, a typical Apache family still living in the traditional house we call a wickiup. It is a one-room shelter made out of poles thatched with beargrass. This morning, there would be snow drifted against the outside of the shelter and red mud around the east-facing doorway.

Inside, there would be maybe six pallets for the family to sleep on. They lie around the fire built on the dirt floor in the center. The family might consist of an aged grandmother, stooped but still proud and not willing to give up; a mother and father, old before their years; two school-age children; and an infant whose little body is racked with a cough because it is not yet strong enough to resist the exposure and dampness. Also in the wickiup would be the few provisions the family has and all of their worldly possessions.

They would begin to stir early—long before sunup—throwing a few sticks of juniper and oak on the fire to ward off the morning chill. Water for washing would be dipped from a can, which had either been carried or hauled from the creek on the back of a burro. The meager breakfast would be cooked over an open fire and divided among the family members. Coffee would be consumed by the children as well as the grandmother—not because it is what children should drink but because it is warm and it fills the stomach. Sometimes there is sugar to put in the coffee; and sometimes there is none.

Come 8:00 a.m., the two children will be standing beside the road waiting for the bus to take them to the day school some 5 miles away. Their shoes will be muddy, but their dress and shirts will at least be clean and neat. Their parents see to this because they know the value—the absolute necessity—of education. They will be looking forward to the ride in the warm bus, the comfortable classroom, and the warm meal they will get through the school lunch program.

The father—*if* he is one of the lucky few that has a job and *if* the sawmill is operating that day—will leave early because he has a 5-mile walk to get to work. It is a tough road for him, and he feels that he is in a rut but he must keep plugging away because he hopes that *maybe, someday,* things will change for the better. He knows that his fifth grade education limits his ability for advancement, but the kids will tough it out and complete their schooling. They might even afford—somehow—one of those neat little houses he has seen recently on other parts of the reservation, with running water, a stove, a real inside bathroom, and even separate rooms to sleep in.

He had heard talk of the housing program and only last week made the 50-mile trip to the agency and applied. But he could not get a house because the "loan funds were all used up" and besides, "he did not have a steady job and therefore could not qualify." But, *maybe, someday,* the kids would fare better and he would have to keep doing the best he could.

Gentlemen, thus far I have not painted a very pretty picture for you. I know that it is hard to visualize the conditions I have described, unless you could see it and live with it day after day as my people do. But I have told you the truth and given you only facts. Sure, I can quote statistics of how many are unemployed, percentages of how many are inadequately housed, undereducated, and underfed. I will give you some specifics later on. But if I do this only, I feel that we will miss the point entirely.

The point is, gentlemen, that in this day and age, these conditions should not be permitted to exist at all.

We have people able and willing to work. But the truth of the matter is that there are not enough jobs to go around. The unemployment rate will go up as high as 65 percent during the winter months. Why? Because our economy is based almost entirely on livestock, lumber, and recreation activities. Much effort has been put into these developments by the tribe, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and others. And these activities thrive in the summer, but fall off sharply in the fall and winter.

Obviously, the need here is to diversify and attract other industries to provide year-long employment. Perhaps to bring private industry into the picture and have them utilize the work force available. Progress has been made, but more *must* be made soon. With industries locating on reservations, there comes with it many job opportunities and subsequent income for the once unemployed. There is no doubt that this would have a definite, positive impact on the economy.

Progress has also been made in the field of education—but not yet enough. Greater efforts must be made in the areas of adult education, in training and in retraining; in home care; and in family budgeting. A way must be found to help the Indian reconcile his social and cultural background to that of the white man while still retaining his own language and the best of his culture.

Poverty and health problems go hand in hand. They breed on each other. The United States Public Health Service has done a marvelous job in our area with the limited resources available to them. These limitations must be removed, at least to the extent that adequate facilities and personnel can be provided to meet the minimum needs of the people. More help in the field of health education is badly needed. Some way must be found to help the people help themselves. They must learn how to prevent and assist in the curing of the common maladies that are so prevalent.

I have touched on only a few of the problems we face. I repeat that the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Public Health Service, the tribal council, and others have done much and made great strides on the reservation—in many cases providing yeomen service within the limitations of the funds and resources available to them. We have benefited from the community action program, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, Headstart, and other poverty programs on the reservation.

I believe it is a fairly well-known fact that Indians have responded to the War on Poverty very enthusiastically and optimistically. The community action program phase has given the Indian his first real opportunity to administer his own programs and to fight his own poverty war. The OEO has been a challenge, but a rewarding one.

However, in the last few months, funds have become quite scarce, which has definitely curtailed the scope and activities of Indian programs. Also, the "farming out" of various phases to other agencies has caused complications. I cannot overstress the need to improve this situation, which will enable us to have the kinds of programs we need.

But, gentlemen, it is not enough. Not when the *majority* of our people are still living under the conditions similar to those I described earlier in this presentation.

New ways must be found and more must be done as long as a single "pocket of poverty" exists in the rural areas or anywhere else. In our case at the moment, it seems that we have more "pockets" than pants.

As was stated in the beginning of this testimony, I am basing my statement primarily on the situation at the White Mountain Apache, but the same, similar situations can be found on all Indian reservations.

Again, I thank you for the opportunity to be heard, and I hope that my presentation will be beneficial in your important task.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lupe, what position do you have at the Fort Apache Reservation?

Mr. LUPE: I am the chairman of the Fort Apache Tribe.

The CHAIRMAN: Your prose is excellent, and we certainly did enjoy your presentation.

Mr. LUPE: Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: I would like to ask now if the members of the Commission have any questions to ask at this time.

I will recognize Dr. Roessel.

Mr. ROESSEL: Mr. Lupe, I would like to ask one question. This morning, a person spoke to us about the fact that it is inevitable and perhaps desirable that the Indian be assimilated.

I would like to know what you feel about this. I noticed in your statement that you made a point of saying that the Indian, the White Mountain Apache, should retain his own language and the depth of his culture.

Now, I would like to know what you think about the statement that the Indian should be assimilated.

Mr. LUPE: I was not here when this statement was made, but the way I gather the question is within the area of giving up my culture or not.

We, the Indian people, are a proud people, we are a proud race. I think we have the honor, the only true race that has the honor of being recognized as true Americans.

Now the question as stated there asks, Do you want to become a foreigner; and I don't believe so.

The CHAIRMAN: Dr. Davis, do you have a question?

Mr. LAWRENCE DAVIS: I presume you have said this in so many words, but would you restate what you think is the great need, the greatest single need or the best approach to the problems of the Indian as you described them; and I think you said that the majority of your people live in those conditions which certainly are most deplorable and undesirable.

What do you think can be done and should be done to change that situation on a permanent basis?

(Pause.)

I am assuming now that when we talk about assimilation, we are not thinking in terms of giving up the value of the Indian culture, but being able to take jobs and get into the mainstream of society without giving up the things you hold dear. Now, speaking in terms of retaining his culture, what do you think is the immediate solution to the problems of the people you have described?

Mr. LUPE: As to this question, I would like to go back on the culture again.

Like I told you, the Indian people are a proud people and a proud race. We like to retain our own culture as much as we can, but since the foreigners have arrived, they brought their own culture, and they have the dominant culture. We have the greatest challenge here, trying to learn your culture. We are so overrun with a culture that is no longer ours, but something different, that this becomes a challenge; and Indians love challenges. The way to work ourselves up is to learn this culture that is no longer ours; it is through education; it is through contact.

The more education we have, the more we adapt ourselves to the culture that has never belonged to us. But I think we can still retain our culture; and this must be job opportunities, but I believe this must unfold on our reservation.

Mr. LAWRENCE DAVIS: Mr. Lupe, are there any programs of education which encompass giving a hot meal in the morning to these children who live in the one-room huts, but who go to school without a proper meal? Do they get fed any supplementary meals when they get to the schools?

Mr. LUPE: We have—the tribe has tried to provide in some way something to help the child go to school. On my particular reservation, money is provided for meals at school.

Mr. LAWRENCE DAVIS: Before we leave this point, I want to be sure I understand you.

No. 1, you feel that education is the main key; and No. 2, of course, jobs are essential; and I think you implied there that with education you can adapt to the dominant culture, and at the same time, be able to retain your values of the Indian culture that you hold dear; in other words, that is the objective as you see it for the Indian people?

Mr. LUPE: Yes, sir.

Mr. FISCHER: Did you hear Mr. Greer's testimony this morning?

Mr. LUPE: I don't believe I did.

Mr. FISCHER: Well, let me ask you this, is there any effort being made now by the White Mountain Apaches to bring industry to the reservation?

Mr. LUPE: We are more or less constantly striving to entice some means of employment on our reservation. One of the avenues is getting some industries, some plants, on the reservation.

Mr. FISCHER: Is the Bureau of Indian Affairs active at all in helping you in this regard?

Mr. LUPE: We have a cooperation system on the reservation. We enjoy this, and we do not try to overrule one another. We compromise on all of our problems. We approach our problems in this manner.

Mr. FISCHER: Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN: Any other questions?

Mr. GIBSON: I have a question or two.

We know that the Bureau of Indian Affairs as well as other agencies play a role with the Indian reservation.

I wonder if you would comment on the kind of relationship the reservation has to the State government, whether or not they are assisting, whether the State assists the reservations with economic development, assists you in your efforts; or whether or not the State assists you in trying to get industry and create job opportunities on the reservation for your people; and whether you could describe in any respect the activities of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, whether they are aggressively moving to help the reservation meet the various problems that it has?

Mr. **LUPE**: The BIA, since I got into the leadership position of my tribe, as far as I know, the BIA is very strongly helping our tribe. I am speaking for my tribe; I am not speaking for the other tribes. There may be some difference between BIA in connection with my tribe and the connection of BIA with other tribes that exist. I just do not know that.

But, as far as I know, our relationship, as I have stated before, is good.

Mr. **GIBSON**: Could you give me some illustrations of what is good about it and what kind of benefits they are bringing to the reservation, the kind of benefits that are coming to the reservation through the Bureau of Indian Affairs?

Mr. **LUPE**: Because of the BIA on our reservation, we have a recruitment program which the tribe could not absorb in financing this project.

We also had a road maintenance program on our reservation which the BIA has handled, and they had their own heavy equipment, and there was quite a training aspect behind it.

Mr. **GIBSON**: Excuse me for interrupting you. Those two kinds of projects and any of the others—is there employment of members of the tribe in these things; that is, are they learning, for instance, to handle the heavy equipment and so forth?

Mr. **LUPE**: Yes, they are.

Mr. **GIBSON**: Thank you.

The **CHAIRMAN**: Now, I will recognize Mr. King.

Mr. **KING**: I am tremendously impressed with your presentation, and being a Midwesterner, it is a real pleasure to meet some of you people.

Would I be out of order to ask your educational background? Certainly, you have displayed tremendous leadership here for your race and you are certainly a credit to them. Would you care to tell us a little something about yourself?

Mr. **LUPE**: All right. I went to the parochial school off the reservation in my earlier days. I spent about 5 years under the BIA school program, the fifth grade. I was educated in a Catholic school. Later, after I graduated from high school, I went into the service, the United States Marine Corps, and I had a little service activity in the Korean War.

After that, I came back and took in college at Arizona State University for 2 years; and I got married then, and that ended it.

Mr. **KING**: Thank you so much.

The **CHAIRMAN**: I was really very interested, and I am glad that Mr. King asked the question.

I am very much impressed with your ability and, of course, I can truthfully state to the Commission that you reflect a tremendous credit to the people whom you represent.

Mr. **LUPE**: Thank you.

The **CHAIRMAN**: We are very grateful for your presentation.

Mr. **STANLEY**: Mr. Chairman, I have just one quick question.

The **CHAIRMAN**: All right, go right ahead.

Mr. **STANLEY**: Toward the latter part of your statement, Mr. Lupe, you made some mention that part of the programs of OEO created some problems. I wonder if you have specific instances of that which you could tell us about?

Mr. **LUPE**: Well, lately, the farmers have been transferred to the Labor Department from OEO—I had reference to the farm portion—and under this OEO, we have more or less a direct application to Washington on this. We have direct contact in this connection.

Two years ago, we had direct funding, and a year later, they changed this. Instead of getting direct funding from the Indian desk in Washington, we had to go through the State office.

When they did this, they cut our program way, way down; whereas, we had employment of 350 kids under a Neighborhood Youth Corps program in the early part of the OEO, when this was transferred to the State, you could only employ 35 during the school year; 50 during the summertime; and, as I say, 35 during the school year.

This tremendously hurt us and they are still trying to locate just where this money should be funded from; and we are caught in between. As to our program, we just do not know where the confusion is.

Mr. **STANLEY**: You mean, you now have to go through the State technical assistance office in order to get funded?

Mr. **LUPE**: No, not technical assistance. What I was trying to say is that the State had an office under the NYC program, and the State is directly funded through NYC. The State distributes these funds to counties and towns and Indian reservations; but, before, we had direct funding, and this is no longer possible.

Mr. **STANLEY**: The NYC organization is merely the type of organization that has a State representative, a State office, and of course they have a National office, is that true?

Mr. **LUPE**: Right.

Mr. **STANLEY**: And what you are saying is that the total funding was reduced, and that is the second part of my question. The allocation for your particular reservation was probably reduced accordingly; and, this is true, of course, all over the country.

Mr. **LUPE**: Yes, I suppose so, but I believe I can truthfully speak for the Indian people throughout the country that we have tremendously benefited from the OEO programs, and we hope that they will not do away with the OEO.

Mr. **STANLEY**: That is what I was trying to get to. You are still interested in continuing the concept of OEO, is that correct?

Mr. **LUPE**: Yes, that is true.

Mr. **STANLEY**: Thank you.

The **CHAIRMAN**: Now, Mr. Woodenlegs.

Mr. **WOODENLEGS**: I would like to ask a question. You talked about a cattle program?

Mr. **LUPE**: Yes.

Mr. **WOODENLEGS**: Individuals?

Mr. **LUPE**: Individuals and tribe.

Mr. **WOODENLEGS**: The Cheyenne in Montana bought cattle from San Carlos in 1940, as well as in 1938 and 1939, where the

Indian people would buy from one another, and I would like to ask you—well, do you lease your land?

Mr. **LUPE**: No, we do not lease our land for cattle grazing.

Mr. **WOODENLEGS**: You are using reservation lands?

Mr. **LUPE**: Yes, we are.

Mr. **WOODENLEGS**: All of it?

Mr. **LUPE**: Yes, we are.

The **CHAIRMAN**: Any further questions?

Dr. Henderson, you have a question, I believe.

Mr. **HENDERSON**: Yes, I have one very quick question. I would like to get into the record the average educational level of the Indians on the reservation, and something relating to the life span of the Indian on the reservation.

Mr. **LUPE**: The average life span of the Indians throughout the country is indicated to be about 45 years.

Mr. **HENDERSON**: What about the average educational level; do you have anything on that?

Mr. **LUPE**: The fifth grade.

Mr. **HENDERSON**: Just two more quick questions. Do you receive funds from the Government, that is, direct payments on the basis of the number of Indians on the reservation; do you receive any funds of that sort?

Mr. **LUPE**: I do not understand your question.

Mr. **HENDERSON**: Do you receive any direct payments from the United States Government on a per capita basis?

(Pause.)

Let us say there are 200,000 Indians, for example, on a reservation; do you get any funds from the Government based on that population?

Mr. **LUPE**: No, that program has never come around yet. However, I hope it does.

Mr. **HENDERSON**: Do the Indians qualify for welfare payments?

Mr. **LUPE**: Yes, they get welfare.

Mr. **HENDERSON**: What proportion of the Indians on your reservation would qualify?

Mr. **LUPE**: On my reservation, all the old people and all the unemployed; and I am talking about half of my people.

Mr. **HENDERSON**: Have any of the foundations shown any particular interest in the upward movement of the Indians in terms of economic development, job training, and educational training? I say this not from the standpoint of interest in the sense of anthropologists coming to study the Indians, but in terms of interest by foundations or by private philanthropists?

Mr. **LUPE**: Are you talking about the progress or what?

Mr. **HENDERSON**: No, are you knowledgeable as to whether any Foundation, let us say the Ford Foundation or the Rockefeller Foundation— Have they shown any interest in the upgrading of the Indians on the reservation, the upgrading of the Indians by way of education and training?

Mr. **LUPE**: Yes, to some point. Presently, the administration that I am dealing with right now, the tribal council, we are trying to make contacts with other foundations to assist our tribe for employment and for other programs and activities; that is, education and so forth.

Mr. **HENDERSON**: Thank you.

Mr. ROESSEL: I think it should be said that generally speaking, foundations have not shown an interest in Indian reservations because they say that the Federal Government is already involved in those kinds of programs; for example, the Ford Foundation takes this stand.

Mr. HENDERSON: Well, when I asked the question, I knew the answer, but I wanted to get it in the record.

In these approaches to rural poverty, there are several sectors of society where Congress has to play the role; and the role of the foundations in terms of the amount of money they have, I was just curious as to the extent they have played any role in the upgrading of the Indians.

Mr. LUPE: I think in this area here, it depends on the Federal Government, just how much pressure they can put on them, and how they can compromise with these foundations.

Mr. HENDERSON: I know they sponsor anthropological studies, but I was curious about the financial assistance.

Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN: I will recognize Dr. Jackson.

Mrs. JACKSON: I keep in mind the father who could not get the loan because of his education, and the place you described where he lives with his children.

Also, I am impressed with your record; and also, something that my people and your people generally say when asked, "Why do you want an education?" and the answer, "To help my people."

Now is there something happening in the public schools which fails to motivate us so that the highest level of educational attainment is the fifth grade? If so, I would like to have you comment on it, give us the challenge so that we might take it back with us. Why is the highest level of educational attainment only the fifth grade—because, if we continue in that direction, how will education then help buy some of these things that embody our American culture, like homes?

Mr. LUPE: I think in the area of education, this fifth grade average education thing is going to change in the next few years.

Presently, holding the top office on my reservation and being my age, I feel like I know the problems and know how to solve these problems.

It is a tremendous, you might say, a challenge to me to tell my people they must go beyond the fifth grade. It comes down from the family home environment.

I think earlier I stated that we have a challenge of trying to adapt ourselves to another culture that does not belong to us. This is something that we have to overcome, and it does not come easy to us.

Once we do that, we are well on the road; and we will still be retaining our own heritage and culture.

The CHAIRMAN: All right, one more question by Mr. Gay.

Mr. GAY: This really is more of a statement than a question.

I have been a student to some degree of the Department of the Interior activities for the past few years, and I am shocked at some of the facts that you have stated before this Commission with respect to why the Bureau of Indian Affairs has been doing some of these things. Now this is absolutely shocking to me if I am to believe what I hear, as a resident of the Washington area off and on for the past 24 years, at some of the testimony and some of the requests for appropriations and where the money went.

I just wanted to be sure that got in the record.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Lupe, we are very grateful to you, sir.

Mr. LUPE: Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Be sure and leave your statement behind, Mr. Lupe.

Mr. LUPE: I think you already have a copy, Mr. Chairman, and I will check to be sure.

The CHAIRMAN: All right, sir, thank you.

I might mention this in passing. Our interest in the comments and, of course, the discussion that precipitates the comments has actually caused us to outstrip our time. We are running a little behind time.

I would like to call now Peter MacDonald of the Office of Navajo Economic Opportunity at Window Rock, Ariz.

First, I would like to ask Mr. MacDonald if he could possibly summarize his statement, and you may be assured that your full statement will be in the record, and thereby you would give us more time to ask some questions.

Would that be an imposition on you, Mr. MacDonald?

Mr. MACDONALD: No, sir, it would not.

The CHAIRMAN: I would just request that you summarize what you have to say and be sure that we have your statement for the record. It will be copied into the record just as if you had presented it. I know that the members of the Commission are interested and thereby we will have some time to ask you some questions. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF PETER MACDONALD

Mr. MACDONALD: My name is Peter MacDonald, office of Navajo Economic Opportunity (ONEO), Window Rock, Ariz. I will talk about "Poverty on the Navajo Reservation."

The Navajo Tribe of Indians are the largest tribe of Indians in North America. Their reservation covers 25,000 square miles of northern Arizona, northwestern New Mexico, and extends into southern Utah—an area as large as four new England States—with a population of 115,000 Navajos.

Life on the reservation is, for most Navajos, a condition too primitive for most Americans to conceive, and a seemingly hopeless poverty. The land is mostly semidesert. There is almost no industry, and farming is almost impossible because of lack of water or rainfall. Traditionally, Navajos have existed by sheep raising, but this offers only the most meager existence.

The median income for the Indian residents of the reservation is said to be $1,900, or much less than that, for a family of 5.4, which should be compared with the national figure $7,720 for a family of 2.8. There is 80 percent unemployment and underemployment and little industrial development in sight. Illiteracy is prevalent, and English is a foreign language for practically everyone. In reality, about an average family income is approximately $600 a year.

With all this, there is a population explosion twice the rate of the rest of the nation. There are 42 births per 1,000 population compared with 22 for the United States, and it will continue to spiral upward at the rate of 4 percent per year.

Life on the reservation is isolated and frustrating because of lack of communication and transportation facilities. There are only 700 miles of paved road on the reservation as compared, for instance, with an area of the same size, West Virginia, which has 35,000 miles of paved road. Lack of roads means remoteness from educational facilities, medical facilities, and job opportunities. It discourages industry from locating here. It leaves a person a virtual captive of isolation. Other rural areas have county and State roads, but the reservation does not have this.

Unemployment on the Navajo Reservation is so prevalent as to make so-called pockets of poverty across the nation appear to be prosperous by comparison. The Commissioner of Indian Affairs has recently stated there is 80 percent unemployment among Navajos. The few jobs that exist on the reservation are generally not available to Navajos because they have too little experience or training.

This unemployment problem is largely brought about by extreme isolated areas, lack of work opportunities available in areas adjacent to the reservation, and underdeveloped industrial potential. Some jobs exist but the requirements are high; and qualified Navajos are not available due to the low educational level of the Navajo people. There is also lack of vocational training facilities on the reservation. Lack of developing employment opportunities within these communities is also responsible for the high rate of unemployment.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs has, for a number of years, conducted what they call the "relocation program," which trains Indians in various trades and skills and then relocates them in a large metropolitan city. But it has not been very successful. One out of every three Navajos returns to the reservation each year. These people have not been prepared to live in another environment and society. And the majority of those that remain in cities live in slums and abject poverty.

There is a whole new and different set of white middle-class values to adjust to, a new way they must handle their money. In many cases the inability to speak fluent English discourages association with neighbors. Sometimes an Indian encounters racial discrimination. Relatives are far away. All these combine to make a Navajo family feel lonely, inadequate, rejected.

Unhappy in the city and facing near starvation on the reservation, the Navajo family feels trapped, hopeless, and often turns to alcoholism.

Something like a halfway house is needed where these families who are suddenly dumped in another world can get help to bridge the gap, to be educated into the new way of life. They need a place where they can turn to seek an explanation about all the new complexities and pressures of urban life.

Attempts by Navajos at earning a living by farming have met with very little success. The semiarid land conditions, the lack of dams to store irrigation water, the high alkali content of the water, and the lack of expert technical assistance discouraged Navajos from pursuing farming. The vast Navajo land cannot supply adequate grazing for the diminishing sheep which was once one of the major economies of the Navajos; consequently, the ever-presence of poverty is apparent.

Very much the same difficulties of arid land apply to stock raising. While statistics claim it takes 600 sheep to produce $3,000 net income annually, the average Navajo family has less than 50 sheep and pretty skinny ones at that. Obviously, a family can realize very little commercial income from this, and the flock serves mostly to supply the Navajos' limited diet of mutton stew, fried bread, and black coffee. On this diet many of the children have been found to be suffering from nutrition deficiencies.

Housing on the Navajo Reservation varies from scrap-lumber shacks to modern multiroomed dwellings with average modern conveniences. A vast majority, however, have no plumbing nor electricity, and provide for no sanitary or modern facilities. For instance, Chilchinbeto, a reservation community, comprises 154 square miles containing 82 homes. All of the homes, except one, were found to consist of one room with an average size of 12 x 12 feet and were occupied by an average of six individuals per home.

The consequence is leading to problems of health, particularly in sanitation, considering that 60 percent utilize cooking and heating facilities which consist of homemade stoves constructed from discarded oil drums. Seventy-five percent of the homes studied were more than a mile from any source of domestic water.

Changes are evolving with the combined efforts of agencies of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the U.S. Public Health Service, and the Navajo Tribe; the most significant single attempt underway is through the home improvement training program of the Office of Navajo Economic Opportunity. The program is designed to train local men in basic carpentry and home-building skills. An important byproduct is the actual building and improvement of homes for poor families. Where necessary, the program has relied upon the Navajo tribal welfare program, which for several years has provided materials—but no plans nor manpower for construction—to needy families with inadequate houses.

Since the establishment of education for the Navajos 100 years ago, the system has produced only one Navajo medical doctor, and the Navajo people cannot wait another 100 years to get another doctor. Forty percent of the population is school age. Only 2,500 graduate from high school each year, and 300 of them enroll in a college level institution; but only 10 receive college degrees each year. Ninety-seven percent of those who enroll in the college simply cannot adapt themselves to a society which encompasses them and requires them to adjust to a way of life which is entirely different from their native environment.

Some factors which contribute to the high rate of college dropout are: A Navajo student requires more than just academic preparation for college. He requires assistance in adjusting to a new culture and needs further improvement in English language. Without these, a Navajo student is forced to cope with more pressures than the average college student. Even in high school the Navajo child is subjected to special hardships. Ninety percent of the Navajo children must leave home and attend boarding school in order to obtain a high school education. Being away from home imposes difficulties and often homesickness, which interferes with their performance in school.

In the year 1965, a dawn of new hope for the people appeared in the East, Washington OEO. This new hope was the ONEO opportunities, which provided the Navajo people with a new kind of experience. Self-planning and self-direction, including the education for four- and five-year-old children from the deprived, neglected, and poverty-stricken homes has become a reality. The 72 classrooms which serve 1,440 children is but a drop in the bucket when you think of the other 5,000 pre-school-age children who do not yet have the opportunity to be a part of this new dawn —the Headstart program. We have a very definite need for more high schools.

A certain trading post on the Navajo reservation is owned by two non-Navajos, a husband and wife. The value of the trading post exceeds one-half million dollars. In several federally insured savings accounts in banks off the reservation, the trader and his wife have total cash deposits exceeding $150,000. The bankbooks show regular deposits with no withdrawals. The trader and his wife spend every summer touring Europe. They own stocks and bonds worth over $50,000, an airplane, three automobiles, and a luxurious home adjacent to the trading post store. The safe in the backroom of the store is full of Navajo jewelry and cash. Within a 30-mile radius of that trading post, its trading area, one can find nothing but poverty—large Navajo families living in small log houses with a small herd of sheep to support them and maybe some public assistance.

Why is the trader so well off and his customers so poor? Because that trader has a captive market and is the only buyer for the only things of value that the Navajo can produce—jewelry, rugs, wool, and sheep. Because every transaction between the trader and the Navajo credit is an amount far less than the fair value of the Navajo's goods. In exchange for the trader's credit, the Navajo takes goods from the store at outrageously inflated prices—for example, a 10-cent can of beans for 50 cents, a $3 shovel for $8; under no circumstances will he buy for cash. Because the trading post is also the only local United States Post Office and all the welfare checks for all the recipients show for an address the trader's personal box number. By the time the checks arrive, the recipient has obtained needed goods from the trader on the same one-way credit terms and sees the check only long enough to endorse it with an inked thumbprint for a signature. This describes one trading post on the reservation. There are a total of almost one hundred, and most fit this description.

A car dealer from a town near the reservation sold a pickup truck to a Navajo on the installment plan. When the buyer, with a family of six, lost his job and failed to make one payment, the dealer arrived to repossess the pickup. The Navajo pleaded to keep the pickup for at least 2 more weeks because he needed it to obtain other employment, to haul water for domestic use, to haul wood with which to cook, and to drive to a new job. The pleading fell on deaf ears. The dealer began to beat the buyer with a chain until he lay bleeding on the ground, took the pickup, resold it, and then sued the Navajo for the balance due on the installment contract.

These are not isolated or unique case histories of legal problems of the individual Navajo; there are many more. They can be classified as legal problems because a lawyer can do something about them, but they are really facets of the larger Navajo problem—lack of education, immobility, the inability to take advantage of the protection of laws that are on the books.

Perhaps the greatest failing in all the programs administered to Indians is the fact that Indians were never consulted as to their needs and desires. So-called experts designed programs on the assumption that they knew best what was good for the Indian. This ranged from destruction of the Indian's identity to a paternalism that robbed the Indian of his initiative and replaced it with chronic dependency.

It is not only what programs are provided but how they are conceived that is important. For instance, with all the education programs now in effect on the reservation, all ignored Navajo history and culture, not realizing the psychological need for pride in one's identity.

Among the much-needed programs is one that would have as its goal and purpose the encouragement and educating of poor people's children to become topnotch professionals— doctors, lawyers, engineers, educators. Not only would this pull many members of a generation out of poverty but professionals are sorely needed by the Navajo Nation in order that it may move ahead under Navajo leadership and technological talents. In addition, it is necessary to train more Navajos in the art of business management and administration so that Navajos can realize better incomes as well as contribute to the economic development of the Navajo Nation.

Now, just a side remark here. If the audience here or members of the Commission are wondering where my feathers are, this is the molting season for the Indians.

Contrary to the Hichoua (sic) Tribe involved in the F-Troop TV series, by no means are the Navajos contented nor do they enjoy the plight they are in. We think this is a very serious problem that we are facing, and we are very much concerned and would like to do something about our problems, given the opportunity.

Of course, I am not here to tell you the sad old story that has been told from time to time about we Indians no longer are like a hungry babe in its mother's arms, but we are more like a hungry wolf on a lonely trail, because our forefathers were very lenient with the Pilgrim Fathers.

I am not going to say this because this has been repeated, as I said, many, many times.

However, the Commission is here to learn about rural poverty regarding Indians, and this is what I have tried to talk to you about, the facts on poverty and on the Indian reservations; and, specifically, on the Navajo Reservation.

In addition, a unique adult education program with a lot of imagination is needed to go tackle the illiteracy problem of the Indians on the Navajo Reservation. We do not have the same rural situation as other rural areas that you might know of.

As I mentioned, we do not even have the little schoolhouses on our reservation nor the county roads; therefore, we cannot congregate at one place unless education and special instruction is taken from house to house; and unless we do this, we cannot touch the majority of the people who need this basic adult education.

A wide-range program of economic development is needed which would include research of labor and natural resources and training in vocational skills, professions, management, and so forth.

It should be a major effort involving educational institutions and facilities of industries.

So I would like to close by saying this, that most all Indian programs throughout the years have fallen short of their intentions and goals.

Why is this?

Much of the OEO programs have done the same thing, except for the community action program, the neighborhood youth program, and the VISTA program.

But all the other programs—the Title II (b), the Upward Bound, the Title III, the rural loan program, the SBA loan programs—all of these have fallen short and the Indians, especially the Navajos, cannot take full advantage of these other acts to pull themselves out of poverty; but the thing that works the best for them today is the community action program, the NYC program, and the VISTA program. Even the Nelson amendment—we haven't seen this on the Navajo Reservation, and we probably will not see it.

The basic adult education is run by the State school systems, and we have probably about 15 or 20 from the whole reservation taking basic adult education. I imagine this was designed so that the State education could say that they are carrying out an adult education program or carrying out adult education activities on the Navajo Reservation; but this is far short of what is needed.

So, as I say, much of the Indian programs throughout the years had high hopes and positive goals but have fallen way short of what they were intended to be.

I think the reason is that the Indians themselves were never consulted, were never involved, to determine what they really want and also to identify by themselves what they think is the proper solution to their problems.

I believe that in order to get these other OEO programs, the MDTA programs, the EDA programs, the lending programs of the SBDC and the FHA, the adult education, the Upward Bound, the work experience, the Nelson amendment—if the Indians are to take advantage of all these opportunities to the fullest extent, I think the Commission and all of those who are concerned with Indian problems must take a closer look and make an evaluation as to why these programs are not making an impact on the Indian reservation, especially that of the Navajos, where we have the complicated problem of living in 3 States and about 15 counties.

So this is the situation with the Navajos.

In summary, I would like to say that there is one thing that the Navajos would like to see because of its large decrepit area, and I think it is something that other Indian tribes would also like to see, at least something like this on the reservation. We feel that there is a great need for a community college on the reservation to serve as a center for education and as a center for research and industrial and community development.

Such a college would provide an ever-available source of technical assistance and could go far toward avoiding the barriers that the Navajo young people are now facing, and it certainly would be an aid to their education.

Navajo youngsters could come to accept higher education as a part of their way of life and not give up their culture.

A feasibility study has been made for a Navajo community college through a grant from OEO, and it has been determined that such a college is both legally and practically possible at this time. The need now is for a source of funds and the know-how to make this dream come true.

I have said many times that no nation, no community, no town, no city, can ever expect to achieve great progress if they do not have in their own nearby State, or in their own town, or in their own community, some kind of a higher institution of learning in the form of a junior college, a community college, or a university.

For the same reason, California, Los Angeles, gets all of the industries. Industries do not go to Los Angeles for the sunshine. They do not go there for the many people that live there. Industries go there because there are universities there, and they can rely on the technical assistance that is available.

So if the Navajo or if other Indian tribes are some day to become self-sufficient and self-dependent, they must be able to have a college that they can call their own and through which they can do their own research and do community work at a research center.

Only then will we see a lot of industries coming onto the reservations.

So, in summation, we may say that the Navajo has come through years of unrelieved poverty which seemed to increase as land conditions became worse and as technology in the world surrounding him raced on leaving the Navajo farther and farther behind. Most programs designed for the Navajo failed, as I have said. None were ever designed by the Navajo.

With unemployment high and the education level low, the Navajo is still in a state of dilemma.

Yet this is not a hopeless condition. Progress has been made in that now the Navajo can recognize and identify his problems and his needs. He is anxious to plan for a future that will pull him out of his chronic poverty. It can be done. It requires programs that will better train and equip the Navajo with the knowledge, the skills, and the leadership not only to hold his own anywhere in America, but to apply these toward economic development of his own reservation.

Although the Navajo cannot go on much longer depending on his present primitive rural economy, he need not abandon his homeland. Indian-implemented programs such as ONEO are proving that with an educational and training system geared to the needs and peculiar problems of the Navajo, with funds and with cooperation of all resources on and off the reservation, the Navajos can develop into a self-sustaining nation.

Thank you very much, gentlemen.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. MacDonald. Do we have a copy of your statement and of your summation?

Mr. MACDONALD: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I would like to advise the Commission here that we are running about an hour and a half behind time.

I do not want to discourage any questions; but I think we should just try to keep our questions to a minimum in view of our time.

I will recognize Mr. Gallegos.

Mr. **GALLEGOS**: Could you tell us where your idea for a junior college came from?

Mr. **MACDONALD**: This idea comes from the present chairman of the Navajo Tribal Council. He is a Navajo, and I believe the tribal council, various members of the tribal council, from time to time have felt this need.

Mr. **GALLEGOS**: Now in proportion to the problems that you are facing, do you feel that the ONEO grants for self-help are sufficient, or do you feel the need for twice as much or 10 times as much; or for what specific purposes do you need the funds, and to what degree have you been consulted regarding the Four Corners project mentioned here in regard to your area this morning?

Mr. **MACDONALD**: Regarding the OEO funds and the grants that we have now, as you know there are talks in Washington to cut down on the poverty program or community action programs.

But I feel that to reduce or to fail to extend or expand the present OEO projects and the Federal programs that we are now working for and with on the reservation, would be like cultivating a field and finding the right seeds to plant, but do not go any further. In other words, failing to plant the seeds and water them until they grow and bear various fruit.

We need to continue the programs which have been started and we need to expand them so that we can plant that seed and water it until it bears fruit.

Mr. **GALLEGOS**: All right, now regarding consultation on the Four Corners economic development program. What about that; is that of any interest to you?

Mr. **MACDONALD**: That is very much of interest to us because, when you talk about Four Corners, the Navajo Reservation generally takes about half of that Four Corners area.

Therefore, it disturbs me that the Four Corners discussion has never been brought to the tribal council. Usually, about one or two members of the tribe will be contacted and then the word gets back that the Navajo Tribal Council was contacted.

Mr. **GALLEGOS**: Thank you.

The **CHAIRMAN**: All right, Dr. Roessel, you are recognized.

Mr. **ROESSEL**: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask one question. I think we need to get down to this point about the feeling of the Navajo Indians or the feeling of the Indians, as opposed to the feeling of the people who are administering the funds and running the programs.

I think the consensus is that we have to involve the professional, which in this case is the Indian, and not the expert, such as I am or that I am supposed to be.

I would like to ask you what you feel about the Indians' desire for assimilation. Do you think this is necessary? Do you feel that the Indian wants to remain an Indian; do you feel that he wants to retain his culture?

Mr. **MACDONALD**: I can only talk for myself and some of the people that I work and associate with. I strongly believe that the

Indians want to be Indians; however, they would like to enjoy the same comforts and opportunities that are available surrounding them.

What I mean by this is that in my own case, I believe I have that sense, that feeling, because before I went to school—my mother and father do not speak English at all—so it wasn't until I was 6 years old that I was brought into a Bureau of Indian Affairs day school.

But I continued to go to this day school, and in the evening I would go home and live with my parents. So I still know a lot about the culture and the heritage of my people; but, yet, I feel that I can survive in this harsh world of mad, mad rush with the new technologies and what have you.

Mr. **ROESSEL**: Now, one final question. Do you feel that if the Navajo Indian had the opportunity of a job on the reservation or a job off the reservation, if he had such an opportunity, which would he prefer and why?

Mr. **MACDONALD**: He would prefer the job on the reservation, just like I prefer, and which I am doing now.

I will give you—I guess the best illustration is to give you my own case.

Why am I on the reservation? As you know, I am an electrical engineer by trade. I left school; I was a dropout at the age of 12 years old. I only finished the sixth grade.

I went back home to herd sheep a little bit and I tried to become a medicine man for awhile, and that didn't work. Finally, Uncle Sam caught up with me at the age of 15, because I was lying about my age, so I served in the Marines; and when I came out of the Marines, I was 18 years old, and only with a sixth grade education.

I was thankful that someone came here this morning who mentioned GED; because you will never know what GED can do for you.

I was 18 years old with a sixth grade education, and I decided that I should go back to school because I couldn't make any headway in the employment world.

So I went from the sixth grade in one year; and at the end of this year, I took the GED tests and passed, so from the sixth grade to a college freshman in one year. I took up a course in engineering. Of course, I didn't know too much about the engineering field, so I was asked what kind of engineering did I want to go into; you know, there is petroleum, mechanical, and civil, and several others.

I said, "Which one is the toughest?"

So the professor said, "The toughest one is electrical engineering."

So I said, "I will take that one."

So I took electrical engineering course and finished it. After spending 2 years in junior college, I went into electrical engineering at the University of Oklahoma and I finished it in 3 years, and I did not want to go back to the reservation at that time, although I had an opportunity to do so.

I wanted to feel out my profession, and in order to do so, I went to work with Hughes Aircraft Company and I joined the company there as a junior engineer.

After 2 years, I became a senior engineer in charge of several components; and then, a year later, I was promoted to a project engineer and I became a member of the technical staff in charge of design and checkout of the guidance system for the Polaris Missile.

So this took me out into the world of business and I had to negotiate contracts with General Electric, Minneapolis Honeywell, and fly down to Cape Canaveral (at that time) and to MIT.

I was rising up; in fact, I was beginning to think like a typical middle-class white man. I had a two-story house, a brick house with a swimming pool in the back, a $28,000 house; and a $17,000 a year job, and a two-car garage, with my kids going to a private school.

But this wasn't enough for me. I always wanted to come back to the reservation because I always thought I could be of some help. So, back in 1963, I took a cut in pay, sold the house, and I came back to the reservation to work with the Navajo Tribe and I have been there since; and I am not sorry.

The CHAIRMAN: You are to be commended for it, Mr. MacDonald. We are very grateful to you.

Mr. Davis has a question.

Mr. NEIL DAVIS: Mr. MacDonald, does a very large percentage of the Navajo people participate as voters interested in government? Are they registered voters?

Mr. MACDONALD: Yes, they do. Those that are registered can vote and they do vote; but, recently in the three Arizona counties, it has been very hard to register all of the other voters because of the literacy law.

Mr. NEIL DAVIS: Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: All right, Dr. Davis, you may proceed.

Mr. LAWRENCE DAVIS: It seems that the Indian will have the responsibility, by his desire, of carrying a dual culture; that is, the culture of the middle-class white man and his own culture that he wants to retain.

Do you think it would be helpful and is there a program of training Indians to become teachers who might be more effective in helping bridge this sort of gap if you could get them into school where most Indians would attend; or has that already been done?

Mr. MACDONALD: There is some effort in that area, but I will tell you that it could be improved, with the emphasis to retain whatever culture there is.

I think I could give you another example of what we mean by retaining our culture and also to enjoy the comforts and conveniences of life as it is today.

Each person is made up of a physical need and an internal need. In our case, we suffer physical poverty. The Navajos who do not live on the reservation live mostly in slums and ghettos and have no jobs, and the Navajos own no homes and have no modern facilities whatever.

You see, my grandfather listened to me talk and he said to me, "What is wrong with you? Are you mad at somebody?"

I said, "No, this is the way I am taught in school."

You see, this is the difference. Without an education, the Navajo just does not understand. These people just simply cannot understand these things. There are other little things, and it just goes on and on.

Mr. GIBSON: Mr. MacDonald, I am interested in having you comment on what role the Bureau of Indian Affairs has played with regard to the Navajo; and in what manner and what quality its contribution may be of the positive kind to the Navajo; and what might be the nature of anything in the Bureau of Indian Affairs which may, in fact, go counterwise to the interests of the Navajo. It is the instrumentality of the Federal Government for extending the interest and concern of the total nation to and on the problems and conditions on the Navajo reservation, and supposedly the indication of peculiar relationships which exist between the general American nation and the various Indian nations is to be constructively channeled through the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

It seems to my mind at any rate to be of staggering proportions, and I would certainly like for us to have in the record of this hearing as much detail about this particular situation as we can get.

Now, do you understand what I am talking about?

Mr. MACDONALD: I think I do.

The thing about the Bureau of Indian Affairs—there is no doubt that the Bureau has been on the reservation and they have made some inroads into the problems, some inroads into the solution of the problems of the Navajo.

For instance, let us take myself, for example. I have been educated as a pupil of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Again, we might say that if the Bureau was doing their job properly, perhaps I could have been better educated. They were there and I was educated; that is the fact.

I do think an analysis as to why I believe that the Bureau of Indian Affairs—although with all of its good intentions and good philosophy, I do not think they have ever hit the target. They have always fallen short of what they intended to do; and it is due to the fact that it is so bureau structured, and it is so entangled; they so entangle themselves with rules and regulations; so now, when the money, it may be $1 million, is appropriated to do road work, the road is built maybe 200 miles away from where the road is needed.

Maybe $10 million is appropriated for school construction; then, where do they build the school? They build it in Albuquerque, not on the reservation; or maybe they build it in California someplace and send the Navajos down there.

So they have been guided by their own rules and regulations and their own methods of solving Indian problems; and it boils down to lack of consultation with the Navajos to participate in the planning of these programs.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. MacDonald. This has been a most interesting discussion and we appreciate your appearance here.

Mr. MACDONALD: Thank you for letting me appear.

The CHAIRMAN: We appreciate it very much.

We would like at this time to call on Wendell Chino, president of the Congress of American Indians, Mescalero, N. Mex.

Are you present, Mr. Chino?

Mr. CHINO: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: All right, Mr. Chino, you may make your presentation, and I would ask that you bear in mind the time factor, since we are running way behind schedule.

You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF WENDELL CHINO

Mr. CHINO: My name is Wendell Chino and I am president of the Mescalero Apache Tribe and will speak on the subject "The Indian Communities in Rural Areas."

The majority of America's rural Indian population lives in or very near severe poverty. I am sure you are all aware of the alarming statistics showing the depth of this poverty, and so I will not dwell on them here. Rather, I prefer to discuss with you some of the characteristics of Indian poverty and some of the problems that must be overcome by the Indian people in making a better life for themselves. I would also like to explore with you possible areas of endeavor that may lead to some solutions.

The Characteristics and Problems of Indian Communities

No. 1. It is important to realize that rural Indian communities are quite different from typical rural communities. Causative factors in these differences are:

(A) The Indian cultures were and are extremely strong. These cultures, over thousands of years, developed entirely different ways of doing things, motivational systems, values, and social practices than did the Western European culture. The Indian cultures are still practiced, in varying degrees, on all reservations.

(B) The Indian culture has encouraged the modern Indian to maintain very close ties with his relatives, local society, beliefs, and his reservation lands. These and other values are sharply opposed to the mere materialistic-individualistic oriented value system of his non-Indian neighbor.

(C) The history of Indian conquest, domination, and administration over the past 400 years has contributed to some behavioral patterns of modern Indian communities and individual personalities. These patterns also cause the Indian reaction to a stimulus to be different than the non-Indian.

What do these factors point to? The most important thing to remember is that there is a difference between Indian and other rural poverty areas. Therefore, all programs attacking Indian poverty must have the flexibility to meet these differences.

No. 2. Indians are not going to leave the reservations in significant numbers in the near decades. The Indian's ties to his culture and his lands are just too strong. He does not find generally satisfactory substitute value systems in urban America. Indeed, he sometimes finds in urban life not only inadequate value substitutes, but a continuation or worsening of economic poverty in a hostile environment. The results of the Bureau of Indian Affairs relocation program over the past 15 years clearly substantiate this trend.

No. 3. We do need to create jobs on the reservation since the Indian does not appear prone to take his poverty to the urban areas of our nation. But the reservations are now in a poor bargaining position to develop job-creating entities in this highly competitive field. Their difficulties are characterized by:

(A) Undeveloped communities lacking sufficient housing, community facilities, roads, transportation and communication media, educational excellence, and cultural activities. This lack not only serves as a detriment to the entrepreneur of industry and American tourist, but especially to the Indian and his family.

(B) Low educational achievements of the average Indian—not because he is incapable but because he has been poorly educated. The lack of education shows up not just in skills but in basic educational subjects such as the English language and mathematics. Indian people have been reared by their traditional families in a reservation environment. Yet they are badly prepared to live even in this environment since their educational background has been that of a typical and average American community—the type of community they do not choose to live in. The system has not educated them to understand their own world and has left them confused and bewildered.

(C) Development capital is lacking on most reservations. Not only do tribes lack enough capital to accomplish economic development, but they also lack seed capital and capital for participation in many of the Federal aid programs requiring matching funds.

(D) Transportational facilities for Indian workers is sometimes nonexistent among the Indian poor. Thus our workers may find difficulty simply in getting to a job once jobs are created on or near reservations.

(E) Governing bodies of many tribes lack capital and tax bases needed to provide community services and social development programs for their people. And so, tribal leaders that could make significant progress in leading their people's development find themselves plagued with frustration and discouragement in their own community.

No. 4. The Bureau of Indian Affairs has been the major, and until just recently, often the only help in developing we have had. We have needed and still desperately need this help. But this help, as it is now received, is not sufficient for the following reasons:

(A) The Bureau of Indian Affairs has resources (men, money, and materials) available which could be of significant value to Indians. The value of these resources to us is, however, only as great as we can make use of them. Since Indians have traditionally had little to say in how these resources were allocated, we feel their value has been of less than optimum value to the tribes.

(B) The Bureau of Indian Affairs has never received enough appropriations to really do the job that needs to be done. They have also tried to do something for all Indians under their care and have thus tried to spread their available allocations equally, more or less, to all of their charges. The result has usually been that the spread is so thin that nothing really important is accomplished. The thin spread of funds over wide geographic areas, layered bureaucracies, and multitudes of staff functions has also resulted in topheavy administration having few remaining funds for human and natural resource development.

(C) The Bureau of Indian Affairs has, originally and legally, a trust responsibility for Indians. This responsibility essentially means that the Bureau of Indian Affairs is expected to protect and care for the Indians. That very philosophy breeds paternalism, since a protector must have absolute control over his ward in order to meet his legal responsibilities. A trustee must also diminish any possibility of risk, since risk, or a change from the status quo, implies violation of the trust responsibility. The trust responsibility is diametrically opposed to developmental activities, since development implies trying new things that may be risky. The conflict between trust and development activity would cause anyone a few sleepless nights and it certainly creates inconsistent actions in the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

(D) Indian tribes have relied almost completely upon the technical experts of the Bureau of Indian Affairs in their development activities. We have observed, however, that most of these technical experts are professional BIA experts first and not particularly strong in a given technical field. There is nothing wrong with this, since we do need experts in the agencies we work with, but we are making a mistake if we rely solely on these people and do not seek the help of others.

The Indian people still desperately need the help of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, but we need a lot more help too. There is nothing now to take the place of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The States are not particularly able nor anxious to help us; and the control of the Bureau of Indian Affairs over tribal affairs through the last several centuries has left the tribal governments weak and untrained. We do need to make fuller use of the BIA resources now, while at the same time formulating new programs for Indian self-development activities. Other Federal programs have become available to Indians only recently. There are some difficulties in our ability to use these other programs, to which I would like to address myself next.

No. 5. Other Federal Government programs now offer tribes the greatest opportunity for advancement and development that we have ever had. Yet our ability to utilize this help for the maximum result has been hampered in the following ways:

(A) Many Federal programs do not specifically recognize Indians. These programs have been written to apply to non-Indian areas. The lack of recognition of the unique cultural, historic, and legal status of Indians make these programs extremely difficult to apply to Indian situations. The crossbreeds of help between what the Indian needs and the program limitations often leave the program results jumbled and lacking in effectiveness.

(B) Matching-fund participation programs cannot be used by many tribes because they have little capital, no tax base, and such a poor population that local-government bond issues are impractical. The tribes' inability to participate is not a lack of interest, show of greed, or failure to sacrifice their funds; it is simply a case of pure financial impossibility.

(C) Undermanned executive staffs, lack of bona-fide technical experts, and lack of funds to hire legal and technical staffs place many tribes at a disadvantage in obtaining Federal help. They have difficulty competing with the "wealthier" poor communities in submitting applications to the Federal Government that are polished, timely, and technically impressive.

(D) The urban orientation of many Federal programs leaves some rural communities and many Indian communities that need this help unable to apply the programs to their communities.

(E) The State allocation system—according to population—of Federal help used by some agencies is particularly hard on Indian tribes. Indians, generally, are among the most poor of any demographic group. It seems, therefore, that they should receive a larger amount of help. But because most Indians live in States with small populations and States with a high level of general poverty, they instead actually receive a smaller per capita amount of help than do the less poor, but poor, urban dweller.

No. 6. Indian tribes have tourism and recreation economic development potentials accruing from their vast and spectacular natural resources and their "Indianness." The lack of accommodations and activities desired by most American travelers and our long distances from population centers pose a handicap to this development, however. We lack the developments of a significant nature that could draw the tourists from these centers and thereby the jobs that go with such development. The lack of capital and qualified technical assistance again plague this area.

Following are some possible solutions:

No. 1. All Federal programs should specifically take into account rural Indian reservations in the drafting of new legislation and in working out their administrative procedures. Existing programs should be amended to take into account the unique situation of the Indian tribes and their legal-cultural status, as well as their administrative situations. All programs should realize that Indians have different legal powers, limitations, and capabilities than any other American community.

No. 2. Indian tribes must be encouraged and permitted to deal independently with all Federal Government agencies without Bureau of Indian Affairs interference. Single agency paternalism and control should not expand. We also need the broad base of help and advice other agencies can give us.

No. 3. Indians must start thinking in terms of complete community development as a prerequisite to industrial job creation. Federal agencies should also apply their programs to the total community. Tribes need development of their transportation, communication, education, community, and cultural facilities, and community services at an equal pace. Our Federal housing programs should address themselves to the unique needs of the Indian, recognizing his legal limitations, and realize that urban or agricultural rural solutions may need drastic amendment in order to be effective on Indian housing problems.

No. 4. Indians and the Federal Government need to develop tribal capital tools. Land leasehold capitalization techniques, Federal tax exemptions and writeoff methods, financial guarantee authorities, and intertribal development banks need to be developed. These tools may initially cost the Federal Government revenue; but, in the long run, savings to the Federal Treasury created by self-sufficient communities could significantly reduce Federal expenditures.

No. 5. A concentration of development effort is needed. Many Federal aid programs are based on the premise of equal distribution of its funds on a per capita basis to the people they are intended to serve. I think a change in this thinking is needed. All communities develop at different rates and different times. Some Indian communities are ready and willing right now for a significant change and growth. For others, development help will not be accepted or utilized as effectively. I urge that the Federal Government recognize that these differences do exist and take advantage of them.

Among this nation's Indian tribes, some are especially susceptible to immediate development. Others prefer, right now, to live in a more traditional way. Some tribes have governments and social situations that can take immediate action to maximize the effectiveness of Federal assistance. I believe that those tribes that are ready should be given a larger share of Federal help now to encourage their growth. Then, at a later time, when other tribes are ready, shift this help in their direction. In other words, instead of dividing Federal help more or less equally among this nation's several hundred Indian tribes and groups on a per capita distribution basis, we should give say, maybe the five most-ready tribes a disappropriately large boost for several years. Then shift this high impact help to other tribes as they become ready.

The reason that this shift in thinking is needed is based on several factors. First, there just isn't enough help to go around equally for all Indians who need it. Second, per capita distribution programs often result in not enough development impact being applied at the right time. Thus, instead of a feeling of growth, a shift in value systems that growth can bring, we find large amounts of money being spread so thinly that nothing happens. The spread is so thin that frustrations mount, squabbling starts, administration becomes topheavy, and money is dribbled away on nothing. The big problem here is not just that a waste of needed financial resources results, but that the development momentum in many communities is stifled or destroyed rather than reinforced and strengthened. If we could, instead, concentrate help on a few tribes, enough money is available to do a decent job for them. Once they began to develop on their own and their own momentum begins to attract non-Federal resources, then help should be shifted to other tribes. At least some tribes would accomplish something rather than all floundering endlessly.

An alternative to this approach is, of course, to vastly increase the financial aid available so that all could share in adequate programs.

We must also consider that some rural communities need much broader help than some urban areas. A city may only be in dire need of a few job-producing industries. It may now have transportation centers, adequate schools, good roads, community centers, and theaters. Many rural communities, on the other hand, need assistance in all these areas before their communities can realistically hope to defeat poverty. If these communities show no signs of population out-migration to urban areas, then sooner or later the job has got to be done. To do the job, such a rural community has to have a broader and greater degree of help, on a per capita basis, than does the developed urban area needing much less, but having a greater population. Significant readjustment of the per capita and equal distribution theories will have to take place to get the job done.

This is not a new idea by any means. We are doing it now in certain high Federal impact programs for a few counties of this nation and have done it in Appalachia. We now need to do it in Indian tribes and some other rural areas.

No. 6. Indian tribes can help themselves significantly.

(A) It is time that tribal governments started taking their destiny into their own hands. They should not rely on others to plan their developments without their involvement. They also need to make their own contacts, explore all possible resources and apply these to their needs. This development needs to be based on total development of their resources, community, and people.

(B) Tribes need to start thinking of developing their own administrative and technical staffs to insure continuing progress.

(C) The reservation lands comprise the sole resource of many reservations. These lands can be used as valuable capital tools without alienation from tribal ownership and use. Tribes should begin capital mechanisms that can utilize their land as a capital tool.

(D) Seek out all the expert advice they can get and not rely on any one source of technical expertise. This advice is often relatively inexpensive and can save great amounts of mistakes and money if effectively used.

(E) Start human development programs on their reservations that will help their people better understand the world in which they live and how to cope with it.

No. 7. Indian training and education programs must be structured to educate our people for the world in which he lives. This not only includes the basic tools of English and mathematics, but may include his own tribal government, tribal history, and culture. It probably means that English will be taught as a foreign language and that he will need skill and understanding in his native tongue. Our present schools, educating according to the American norm, have given us several lost generations of Indian youth. We cannot afford to lose another.

No. 8. We need to develop major tourism attractions that will draw the American traveler from long distances to stay on the reservations. Once tourists stay on the reservation, we can develop many small businesses to keep them there longer and provide more things for them to do. The major attraction must, however, be significant enough for the traveler to want to drive a whole day to get to the reservation. He then must find sufficient accommodations to encourage him to want to stay.

Thank you very much, gentlemen.

The CHAIRMAN: We certainly appreciate your appearance before the members of the Commission.

I will allow just one question at this time, due to the time limitations. We have to consider the fact that other witnesses have been waiting here for some time. However, I will allow one question on the part of the Commission.

Dr. Henderson, do you have a question?

Mr. HENDERSON: Twice today we have heard that participation of the Indians in the political process was as high as 80 percent, that as high as 80 percent voted. I was a little bit amazed at this high proportion, and I am wondering if the high vote is carried through up to the point of voting for our Congressmen and——

Mr. CHINO: (interrupting): Voting for Congressmen, you say?

Mr. HENDERSON: Yes, for Congressmen in the United States House of Representatives.

Mr. **CHINO**: A moment ago, I described for you the various rates of development among tribal groups.

Mr. **HENDERSON**: They do vary, do they not?

Mr. **CHINO**: Yes, they do.

Mr. **HENDERSON**: There is such a high proportion, I was just wondering about that. I was wondering if this was a matter of voting within the tribal council; or if it was on a national level.

Mr. **CHINO**: Well, it is a question of politics. Sometimes these politicians go door to door to the Indian people.

Indians cannot participate, for instance, because numerically they are not politically strong enough to elect, let us say, a school board member, unless some laws are changed to see that the Federal monies that are being disbursed for an Indian child take into consideration the fact that an Indian child should have just as much say-so commensurate with the education this child is receiving.

Do you see what I mean?

Mr. **HENDERSON**: All right, thank you.

The **CHAIRMAN**: Do you have a question, Mr. Gallegos?

Mr. **GALLEGOS**: Yes, I do have a question. Do you believe that the Bureau of Indian Affairs should be completely reorganized or that it should have just some surgery?

Mr. **CHINO**: Oh, I believe just some surgery will take care of it.

Mr. **GALLEGOS**: Thank you.

The **CHAIRMAN**: Thank you, Mr. Chino, thank you very much for coming.

Mr. **CHINO**: Thank you, gentlemen.

The **CHAIRMAN**: The next speaker is Mrs. Adelaida Rodriquez, and the Commission will recognize her now. She is from Guadalupe, Ariz. Mrs. Rodriquez, you may give your testimony at this time.

STATEMENT OF ADELAIDA RODRIQUEZ

Mrs. **RODRIQUEZ**: Ladies and gentlemen, my name is Adelaida Rodriquez. It gives me great pleasure in being with you today, representing our modest community. I will begin by giving a short summary of the history of the Yaqui people. As my mom has related to me, the Yaqui people started coming north as early as the 1890's. They first settled in what now is known as Lower 19th Avenue in Phoenix. In 1905 they came east and again settled on what is now the Guadalupe cemetery.

In 1907, the Government gave us a land grant of 40 acres that was to be Guadalupe. Here the Yaquis built their first home. Always living from hand to mouth, time passed to the present, more or less forgotten by larger communities. Many of us left school while still not completing the eighth grade. It was not because we lacked the will to learn, but in most cases the yearly income was and still is under $2,000, and small luxuries like new shoes or a store-bought dress for each of the school age children is but a dream. Our burning desire to learn has been great. How many people would get up at 5:00 o'clock a.m. and go pick cotton at $3 a hundred, come home in the evening and scrub clothes for the whole family?

It's also been said that we are unclean; housing has been very inadequate, thus causing a storage problem in keeping things neat and orderly. Some people say if you would just save your money. I have seen mothers rummaging through boxes in secondhand stores for clothes for their children, so that they could make the family dollar go further. But the Yaquis like the American Indians have always been the underdog.

I remember when a few years back my father injured himself on the job, losing his right eye, leaving him unemployed for some time. Yet there were people after him to sign a release with total disregard for his family. They, the ranchers, will do outright lying to get themselves out of any commitment. These vultures are getting rich on the poor that cannot defend themselves. If we believe there is a heaven, may God have mercy on their souls.

Guadalupe is only 5 miles from Arizona State University at Tempe and 15 miles from the Arizona State capital. We still have a long way to go to catch up with our neighboring towns.

We need housing, sanitation, legal aid, training or retraining programs. In the past most of our men worked for Salt River project—three, four, and five truckloads of workers for substandard wages. Now only some 30-odd were recently hired to clean ditches. Very few have stayed on jobs other than as ditch workers or truckdrivers. Two men that I know had worked for Salt River project as heavy equipment operators for years but were recently replaced because they did not have a high school diploma; and, as you probably know, the Yaquis are not recognized by the Federal Government.

Now school segregation has been number one on the list, and we stand alone. It was not until 7 or 8 years ago that seventh and eighth grades were taken into the Tempe school. First grade to sixth grade still remain in Guadalupe school. This throws us back further, you see. Just imagine, 50 high school graduates in 55 years in a community of 6,000, and not one college graduate.

Home reading is next to nothing. Yet our school lacks a good library and is being used for study just beginning this year.

A room like this would probably make six or seven nice homes with a place for the children to study. Tell me, who can study with the young one hollering, TV going full blast, a nagging mother? Yet the kindergarten is now being abolished to save money. You can't measure people in terms of money! These young ones are the citizens of tomorrow. Educated people can bargain as to what they are worth—just like you, you bargain for a job—maybe you are the best qualified. Organized people, with unions, have power in unity. Poor uneducated people with dozens of other people to push them aside, how can they really bargain?

For example, let's take the case of my father when he lost his eye. What chance did he have, with no one to turn to, against a farmer with a string of lawyers behind him? I, too, can take candy from a 2-year-old.

My mother has tried very hard to help the family by doing washing and taking in boarders. The result is that she is a cripple by arthritis.

When I got to be a teenager, I just couldn't take anymore of this. I ran away to get married. For once I thought about new things for myself. No more hand-me-downs, none at all, because my sister had just plain wore out the dress. My husband and I have worked in the fields hand in hand as recently as a year and a half ago, earning together $8 a day when lucky. My husband, by irrigating, earned $7 or $8 for 12 hours. There have been times when he has brought home $11 in one week if it rained or the fields were very wet and could not be worked. Last year his income was $1,320. Automation has left many men unemployed.

Water has been a problem in our community. A people's company condemned by the health department was sold to a white man for $2,500 in 1957. He used the same wells. But for this man to sell this water was okay. He then sold the company to Tempe for over $147,000 in 1964, a pretty nice sum.

Now our Guadalupe Organization has brought sunlight to our bleak existence. Through the organization we have learned to organize the work together where one person didn't have much of a chance of being heard at city hall or the Nation's Capital. We have come to realize that a committee of three or five have more of a chance.

Our community has a population of 6,000 with 800 registered voters. It didn't take long for us to discover the power of the vote, so you can see we are making progress in many ways.

We are learning more and more all the time on how to get things done that before were impossible. Most of all we are learning how to help each other and at the same time help ourselves, which is very important.

One person who has served our community willingly is Jose Matuz, president of G.O. (Guadalupe Organization). On June 11, 1966, we received a $57,000 grant from the Office of Economic Opportunity. It included money to help staff the new credit union. They also said that we were to set up a service center and a credit union and provide health aids. Our credit union is going very well, and in August of 1965 was worth $56.75 and now, 1 year and 6 months later, we have $22,000 in assets and 400 credit members, which is helping many of us acquire things that once were not possible.

I, for one, feel that this means a happier, brighter future for our people. The service center has a post office, and for the first time home mail delivery has been established. The center also offers many services such as information and referral, transportation, State employment, and three family health aids working there.

On January 20, 1966, we were given a Federal grant from the Office of Economic Opportunity for an adult education program. The advisory board selected Mr. Jesus Oscuna as coordinator, due to his proven ability as being a leader, and as his assistant, Sally Orrantia, who is a semiretired school teacher due to her having a baby. School began on March 4, 1966, with seven certified teachers who are assisted by teacher aids that are residents of the community.

The 90 new students were given standard achievement tests, and they started them off at three different levels 1 to 3, 4 to 7, 8 to 12.

In June, we and the students worked on a fund-raising project for eyeglasses, thus raising $350. Nineteen students received eyeglasses. Also, I would like to add that Maple Leaf Lions Club helped with the remaining bill.

During our school term we also had speakers come in, took field trips, and had potlucks, thus creating a family environment and encouraging us to participate together.

In July, 16 adults took their general equivalency tests, of which 15 obtained diplomas. In August 1966, we enrolled 34 new students, plus 56 from the old group, which comes to a total of 80 altogether. We started having GED tests last weekend, the 21st and 22nd, and the 28th and 29th. Out of this 40 we are testing, we hope to graduate 35, if not all.

Now I would like to thank the Federal Office of Economic Opportunity for letting me be one of the recipients of a GED diploma. But this is only a drop in the bucket. Guadalupes exist all over the country and we will need more day care centers and full-time Headstart and vocational training for adults.

In conclusion, I would like to say that at the present moment I am working for Maricopa community action grassroots project, as a community aid, hoping from this to gain experience so that I can more ably serve my community.

Also, I would like to thank you for your time, and thank our Guadalupe Organization, and thank the people of my community for making it possible for me to be here today.

Thank you very much.

As you can see, I am rather nervous. I am not used to this.

The CHAIRMAN: You just be at ease. We do want to discuss this with you a little bit now.

You have reference to the Yaqui Indian Reservation, do you not?

Mrs. RODRIQUEZ: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, Guadalupe is where, more or less, from where we are right now?

Mrs. RODRIQUEZ: Well, I would say it is about 100 miles, more or less. I am not very accurate.

The CHAIRMAN: Would that be south of here or what direction?

Mrs. RODRIQUEZ: Well, it is 50 miles south of Phoenix.

The CHAIRMAN: Between Phoenix and Tucson, is that correct?

Mrs. RODRIQUEZ: Yes, more or less.

The CHAIRMAN: And what is your position there, Mrs. Rodriquez?

Mrs. RODRIQUEZ: Well, I am a resident there.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, are there any questions by any members of the Commission?

Mr. HENDERSON: Yes, I have a question or two. These people that you said they put to digging a ditch, what did you say they were doing before that?

Mrs. RODRIQUEZ: Heavy equipment operators.

Mr. HENDERSON: They were originally employed as heavy equipment operators or truck drivers and then they took them off of those jobs?

Mrs. RODRIQUEZ: Yes.

Mr. HENDERSON: I see.

Mrs. RODRIQUEZ: As you probably know, the Yaqui people are not recognized by the Federal Government, as all of the other tribes have.

Mr. **HENDERSON**: Why not?

Mrs. **RODRIQUEZ**: Well, I don't know, but I think it is because the Yaquis immigrated from Mexico City; and the American Indians were all born here. I think this would be right; this is my idea.

Mr. **HENDERSON**: Thank you.

The **CHAIRMAN**: Mr. Fischer, you may ask a question.

Mr. **FISCHER**: They were born here, the present generation were born in this country?

Mrs. **RODRIQUEZ**: Yes, they were born here.

The **CHAIRMAN**: They are American citizens?

Mrs. **RODRIQUEZ**: Yes.

The **CHAIRMAN**: Do you have a Headstart program in your community? I think you did mention something to that effect.

Mrs. **RODRIQUEZ**: Yes, and it has been tremendous.

The **CHAIRMAN**: It is successful, in other words?

Mrs. **RODRIQUEZ**: Yes, it is.

The **CHAIRMAN**: Now, have you made a copy of your statement available to the staff here?

Mrs. **RODRIQUEZ**: Yes, I believe I have left one with the staff and I have left one in the pressroom.

The **CHAIRMAN**: Mrs. Rodriquez, we are very grateful to you.

Mr. **HENDERSON**: Could I ask just another couple of questions, Mr. Chairman?

The **CHAIRMAN**: Yes, Dr. Henderson, go ahead.

Mr. **HENDERSON**: If I understood you correctly, you are presently employed by the County Community Action Agency.

Mrs. **RODRIQUEZ**: Yes.

Mr. **HENDERSON**: What do you do?

Mrs. **RODRIQUEZ**: Well, information and referral, and we work with the poverty-stricken people.

Mr. **HENDERSON**: What were you doing prior to that?

Mrs. **RODRIQUEZ**: I was just a housewife.

Mr. **HENDERSON**: And had you ever worked as a domestic servant; did I understand that to be the case?

Mrs. **RODRIQUEZ**: Yes, I did.

Mr. **HENDERSON**: And your educational attainment is at what point?

Mrs. **RODRIQUEZ**: I left school when I was in the seventh grade; and we had 3 months of schooling, and I obtained my GED, general educational equivalency.

Mr. **HENDERSON**: I am extraordinarily intrigued with your presentation and the articulate manner in which you delivered your presentation. You are a perfect example to me of apparently the nonutilization of people, and when the chance comes for a new community action program, you became employed at a level at which you had never been employed before.

Mrs. **RODRIQUEZ**: Yes, sir.

Mr. **HENDERSON**: You are to be commended. Thank you.

The **CHAIRMAN**: Mr. Fischer?

Mr. **FISCHER**: Are you a registered voter?

Mrs. RODRIQUEZ: Yes, I have been a registered voter since I was 21 years old.

Mr. FISCHER: Is the Yaqui community having some political influence now, in your opinion?

Mrs. RODRIQUEZ: I would say so very much now. We have 800 voters and, you know, it does help a little bit.

Mr. FISCHER: Thank you so much.

Mr. GALLEGOS: Do you feel that Guadalupe community could stand a little more attention from the Federal services?

Mrs. RODRIQUEZ: Yes, very definitely. As a matter of fact, I would like very much—I would, and I guess everybody else would like very much—to see Federal housing in our community.

As it is right now, there is a company in Phoenix and this old house, this three- or four-room house, they are selling for $2,000 and $3,000, and they are costing $20 a week, and most of the families are quite large and we need more space.

Mr. GALLEGOS: Is there any agency of the Federal Government who has offered or who has tried to assist in any way to set up co-ops, or has anyone made any effort to put up stores or a supermarket or anything like that?

Mrs. RODRIQUEZ: Well, I think our president would be more able to answer that question. His name is Mr. Jesus Oscuna.

Mr. OSCUNA: Right now at this point, we are working towards trying to get cooperatives for stores and merchandise, you know, and fixing up some place for the people to get their goods, household goods, and things; and this is something that we are trying to get done right now.

Mr. GALLEGOS: Do you think that this is an area for possible redevelopment?

Mrs. RODRIQUEZ: In what way?

Mr. GALLEGOS: In terms of rehabilitation of existing housing. Have there been any efforts made to improve the condition of those houses which you mentioned at all?

Mrs. RODRIQUEZ: No, there has not.

The **CHAIRMAN**: Mr. Oscuna, I did not get your full name. Would you mention it again?

Mr. OSCUNA: My name is Jesus Oscuna.

Mr. GALLEGOS: Could I ask one more quick question, Mr. Chairman?

The **CHAIRMAN**: Yes, go ahead.

Mr. GALLEGOS: Did you state that kindergarten was going to be cut out?

Mrs. RODRIQUEZ: Yes, from what I have heard. A lot of people thought that this would just be a waste of money.

I don't think so because, especially in a home like mine, where there are a lot of children, as some of the others have a lot of children, it would be disastrous because they speak Yaqui and they speak Spanish and they speak a little English, especially those that have older brothers and sisters going to school, you know.

Kindergarten would help when they go on into the first grade. Otherwise, they are always a year behind the other children who are speaking English. These children are behind because they cannot speak English well.

The **CHAIRMAN**: Could we have the name of the other gentleman who is sitting there, and his position?

Mr. **MATUZ**: My name is Jose V. Matuz.

The **CHAIRMAN**: And you are president of the community action program?

Mrs. **RODRIQUEZ**: No, he is president of the Guadalupe Organization.

The **CHAIRMAN**: I see, thank you.

We certainly appreciate you folks making an appearance here today. We will have all of the discussion for the record and all of the remarks you made will be in the record, and please leave behind you what you have written for us also.

Mrs. **RODRIQUEZ**: All right, and thank you, and I am sorry that I was a little bit nervous.

The **CHAIRMAN**: I think you did a wonderful job, and our thanks to you.

Now, the Commission will recognize Mr. Agustin Aguilar from the Santo Domingo Pueblo, Santo Domingo, N. Mex., who will speak on "Indian Problems and Programs."

STATEMENT OF AGUSTIN AGUILAR

(Presented through an interpreter)

Mr. **AGUILAR**: My name is Agustin Aguilar and I first will read a letter from the Tribal Council of Santo Domingo Pueblo, Santo Domingo, N. Mex., to the National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty, Office of The Executive Director:

> The Tribal Council and the people of Santo Domingo Pueblo welcome the opportunity to present this special report to the Commission. We hope that this presentation will help the Commission to take definite steps in helping not only the people of Santo Domingo Pueblo, and all the Indian people of this country, but all citizens living in conditions of rural poverty.
>
> Respectfully yours,
> (Signed) Diego Rosetta, Governor.

Now I will present a report to the National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty from Santo Domingo Pueblo, N. Mex., and I first will summarize the main points.

First, Santo Domingo Pueblo is participating in several programs under the Office of Economic Opportunity, coordinated with the efforts of previously existing agencies. During the past year, the local community action agency has conducted these programs, including Headstart, Community Improvement, Neighborhood Youth Corps, Home Educational Livelihood program, and VISTA, with the support and cooperation of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Public Health Service, and other Federal, State, and county agencies. The attacks on poverty at Santo Domingo are succeeding mainly because of this support and cooperation.

Secondly, the planning and administration of community programs has been a priceless lesson in working together. From the tribal council to those enrolled in training programs, everyone involved has seen the virtues of cooperation. The community action program has been a continuous force for the improvement of conditions at the pueblo, and for the preservation of Indian culture based on communal living. People of all ages

160

have benefited from, and contributed to, the programs. There has been no split between the old ways and the new ways.

Thirdly, despite these efforts, the needs of the people of Santo Domingo remain great. Job-training programs are futile if jobs are unavailable, or if accepting a job means leaving the pueblo and separating a family. The need to stay in school is impossible to explain to young men and women who see high school graduates in the village unable to find rewarding jobs. Economic development is the obvious need, and the most difficult problem to approach. Before the Santo Domingo Reservation can become self-sufficient, a great deal of training and education will be needed. Until that time, threats of termination of Federal obligations are damaging to the plans and spirit of the people.

Fourth, all efforts to improve the conditions of life at Santo Domingo will prove futile, if two general wishes of the people are not respected. The people will not sacrifice their tradition, their culture, and their history as a sovereign tribe in order to more cheaply purchase the benefits of modern American society. The people will not sacrifice control of their land and their affairs as guaranteed by solemn, binding treaties. Through the years, many well-meaning agencies and officials have disregarded these wishes; and by doing so, they have already taken far too much from the Indian people.

Fifth, it is encouraging that many are beginning to recognize the critical needs and the special problems of Indian people, and that the community action program is demonstrating its responsiveness to these needs and problems. At this time, discussion of extreme budget cuts in antipoverty, and skeptical attacks on the value of OEO programs, are not understood by the Santo Domingo people. Community action represents a new spirit on the reservation: a spirit of cooperation that should be encouraged and strengthened, not destroyed so soon.

Sixth, although Santo Domingo, by the nature of its history and culture, is quite different from any other group in the country, common ground for an attack on poverty exists. Perhaps this report will point out the nature of that common ground, and suggest the critical need for a strong and continued attack on common problems.

As a matter of further information, the economic life of Santo Domingo Pueblo revolves around farming, arts and crafts, and limited outside employment. This report will sketch, very briefly, the present conditions in these three and related concerns and will explain the broad outlines of concerted programs for the improvement of these conditions, with emphasis on the importance of the Indian community action program to the people of Santo Domingo.

All of the families at Santo Domingo cultivate small tracts of land, assigned and handed down from generation to generation within the individual families. Chili, corn, wheat, watermelon, and other vegetables bring some income; however, the lack of training, the limited state of tribal and individual financial resources, and the insufficiency of irrigable land have all made it impossible for many of the better farmers to make decent incomes from agriculture.

To the people of Santo Domingo, land and water are sacred and vital. For the development of their economy and the assurance of their survival, the people need help in beginning a progressive program for the subjugation and rehabilitation of reservation lands. Irrigation systems and rangeland must be improved; natural resources on the reservation must be studied and developed. But most important for the future of agriculture at Santo Domingo, there is a great need for dedicated efforts in a training program providing farmers with up-to-date skills and knowledge in the methods of agriculture and marketing.

A start towards meeting these needs is the farm training conducted by the home educational livelihood program, known as HELP. In operation since November 1966, this program involves 30 trainees, 2 local aids, and a farm instructor. For 2 hours in the morning, the men receive a flexible basic education course conducted by the farm instructor and one of the two VISTA volunteers assigned to Santo Domingo. During the remainder of their 6-hour day, the men go into the field where they have been assigned a large demonstration plot.

Equally important to the people of Santo Domingo are their arts and crafts, sold and traded in Santa Fe, Albuquerque, and often as far away as the Navajo Reservation. From these traditional pursuits many of the people derive their sole income; and others are able to supplement their meager agricultural or outside earnings.

But arts and crafts are more than an economic asset. Like the religious and ceremonial life of the pueblo, they are a source of cultural pride and community strength.

Two anticipated developments should be used to encourage arts and crafts at Santo Domingo. The proposed recreation site at Cochiti Dam, and the proposed relocation of Highway 22 will increase tourist travel to the pueblo. The tribe recognizes the emphatic need for an arts and crafts guild and center near the pueblo: To make unnecessary the long trips away from the pueblo; to channel the benefits of tourist interest directly to the people of Santo Domingo; to guard against the exploitation of the village and the people; and, most important, to maintain the quality and to encourage the pursuit of arts and crafts at Santo Domingo.

The sources of steady employment near the reservation are few. Kaiser Gypsum, Aspen Lumber Company, and various companies and organizations in Santa Fe and Albuquerque provide some jobs ranging from the teaching profession to unskilled labor and domestic work. Aspen Lumber Company, currently employing 55 men and planning to hire 25 more, is the greatest source of outside employment.

A striking instance of the benefits of antipoverty legislation was the rebuilding of Aspen Lumber Company's entire plant, with substantial help from Economic Development Act funds, after the plant was completely destroyed by fire in the summer of 1965. The tribal council cooperated with the plant management and the State and Federal Government to secure these funds.

Seasonal farmwork in the nearby area and summer fire-fighting complete the list of job opportunities. While the total income derived from all outside employment comprises a large figure, the average amount earned by each family is woefully inadequate. The chronic lack of education among the people further limits job opportunities, and further emphasizes the need for vocational training.

The home educational livelihood program's farm training has been mentioned. Similar in design is the HELP home economics program, attended by 30 women interested in basic education and home improvement and management. Three local women work as aids, and another works as teacher and coordinator for the entire HELP operation at Santo Domingo. To vary the routine of daily classes, knitting, sewing, and crocheting, the women have sponsored buffet lunches for visitors to the pueblo, a Christmas dinner and program, and a staged fashion show.

The general economic development of the Santo Domingo Pueblo is the most troublesome problem confronting the people of Santo Domingo. The limited progress made in the development of natural and human resources, and the lack of commercial and industrial growth have severely limited the income of the tribal government. Consequently, the pueblo has been handicapped in acquiring needed civic programs and reaching desired objectives. The pueblo has been limited to extremely basic administration, inadequate tribal facilities, and elementary community programs. Funds are available through other sources, such as EDA, OEO, FHA; but the tribe needs help in meeting its share of matching funds as required by the various agencies.

The great need for economic progress should not blind the various governmental officials and agencies, and the people of Santo Domingo, to the equally great need for the maintenance of tribal customs and traditions. The preservation of Indian culture will always be an integral part of membership in the Santo Domingo Tribe. Tribal customs and traditions are sacred, giving a meaning to life and work at Santo Domingo. The people wish to maintain their present ways of life.

On the other hand, this does not imply that modern conveniences and community programs cannot be innovated on the reservation. The council believes that new ways can come into the village without disrupting the communal life of the people. For example, to improve living conditions, the tribal council has brought water and waste disposal systems into the pueblo, with the cooperation of the Public Health Service. Electricity and telephone service are available to tribal members. The availability of a VISTA nurse at Santo Domingo, in the summer of 1966, encouraged the Public Health Service to improve the clinic facilities and extend clinic hours in the village.

Those concerned with progress at the Pueblo must have patience. Even the best programs take time to gain acceptance among the people, perhaps more time than governmental officials expect. The water and waste disposal systems, planned to be completed in 1 year, instead required a great deal of educational work and almost 4 years before the people were ready to accept the systems. As a result, the water system is now complete, but the sewage system is only 80-percent complete. Along with the planning and development of any program at the pueblo, there must be patient, dedicated attempts at education.

The tribe participates in several programs under the Office of Economic Opportunity, providing jobs and training for some of the people. But the effect of the OEO programs has not been limited to the actual number of jobs available to the people. Two sessions of Headstart have lived up to their name. The locally recruited teachers' aids have for the first time, in many cases, been involved with the delights and frustrations of their children's education. Parents of the children, after much hard work by the Headstart staff, have become interested in their children's progress in class. Culminating this effort was the formation of an organized PTA, with elected officers and fund-raising activities, to promote the further participation of parents in the Headstart and other programs. Follow-through Headstart programs, if and when they are enacted by the current Congress, will provide a great opportunity for the improvement of Indian education.

The community improvement component of the Santo Domingo Community Action Agency employs 23 so-called unemployables over 40 years of age, and a local foreman and assistant foreman. Known locally as the oldsters' program, it has contributed to the daily welfare of the entire village. Under close supervision, the oldsters have participated in a variety of substantial community projects, among them: Instituting a weekly trash collection, helping to remodel the historic Santo Domingo Church, and helping individuals to refurbish their homes. Perhaps the most substantial project was the cutting up, moving, re-assembly, and remodeling of a 40-foot Aspen Lumber Company office building.

In a few days, the community action offices will be located in two sections of the building, now located next to the community center. Since December, the farm-training classroom has been located in the other two sections of the building, moved to a convenient site overlooking the main village. During this project, the oldsters disregarded the advice of observers who said, "Tear it down piece by piece and then move it piece by piece." And they disregarded the comments of skeptics who refused to believe that the building could be moved at all, or that it was worth the effort.

The employees of the oldsters' program have continually participated in decisions regarding the direction of the program. They have treated the program as their own, with a great deal of pride and interest in the job they have been doing. Many people in the community have caught the oldsters' spirit.

This description could be continued for all the OEO programs in operation at Santo Domingo: The NYC, the HELP, the VISTA volunteers, the Community Action Agency, and the Economic Opportunity Committee. In general, the people involved in these programs—whether as committee members, administrators, employees, or trainees—have learned to work together for their common good.

The tribe will continue to participate in these and any other programs that meet the needs of the people. For the several programs to be fully effective, there must be successful coordination of Government agencies and officials. That such coordination and cooperation is possible has been demonstrated by the success of the community action programs at Santo Domingo. The Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Public Health Service, the State and county welfare services, and employment services have all increased their efficiency at Santo Domingo, working with the community action program and the tribal council. Neither the HELP operation nor the oldsters' program would have been possible without the full cooperation and support of existing agencies. In particular, the BIA adult education specialist assigned to Santo Domingo has lent the full resources of his facilities and training to both programs. The people of Santo Domingo need the continued efforts of the old agencies and the new agencies. The tribal council favors an expansion of health and welfare programs, and an increase in the number of BIA law-enforcement and probation officers.

The people of Santo Domingo are opposed to the termination of any obligations as guaranteed in the Guadalupe-Hidalgo Treaty, and subsequent agreements between the tribe and the Federal Government. Santo Domingo's original land grant was issued by Domingo Jironzo Petraz de Cruzate in 1689. At that time the Spanish Crown presented gold-headed canes to the pueblo governors as symbols of their authority. After the U.S. Congress confirmed the original Spanish land grant, the Governor of Santo Domingo journeyed to Washington to receive the pueblo's patent and was presented with a silver-headed "Lincoln" cane as his badge of office. Since then, all the governors of Santo Domingo and the other pueblos, have in turn possessed these distinctive canes, symbolizing the historic sovereignty of the Indian people.

The needs and wants of the Santo Domingo people are many. However, the tribal council must impress on the Commission, the Congress, and everyone interested in the future of Santo Domingo, that because of present conditions the people of Santo Domingo want protection to maintain sovereignty over their lands and their affairs. Tribe favors continuation of its present 25-year leasing rather than the 99-year leasing policies proposed by some governmental and industrial leaders. The day must come when the Santo Domingo people themselves will find a way to use all these resources—human and natural—to the fullest extent. And when that day comes, the people of Santo Domingo want to have all their land to use for their own benefit, without the interference of long-term leaseholders.

Everyone should be aware that there is poverty, unemployment, lack of education, lack of vocational training, and lack of opportunities for all Indian people. Because the economy of their reservation is very poor, the people of Santo Domingo need the continued assurance of governmental officials and all concerned with the welfare of Indian people, that our rights to sovereignty over our land and control of our affairs shall not be imperiled; and the assurance that this land, without which we cannot survive, will be preserved unto us, and that our rights over our land and over our affairs shall be in no way diminished or jeopardized.

I want to thank you very much for allowing me to appear here, and I do hope that this honorable Commission can help our poor people.

Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir.

I would like to have the name of the interpreter for the record. Sir, would you state your name for us, please?

Mr. ATENCIO: I am Benny Atencio, director, Office of Economic Opportunity, Santo Domingo Pueblo, Santo Domingo, N. Mex.

I might state for the record that Mr. Aguilar is 73 years old.

He has served as tribal councilman since 1921; and he is very well acquainted with the problems through these years; he is well aware of the problems that face the tribe. And he is also familiar with the progress that the tribe has made through the years.

So, I am sure that he will answer any questions that you people might want to ask or bring up.

The CHAIRMAN: Do you live there in the Santo Domingo Pueblo?

Mr. ATENCIO: Yes, I do.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, was Mr. Aguilar actually selected by the tribal council to be present here with us today?

Mr. ATENCIO: He was sent to you, in tribal language, because it was suggested by the Commission; and I was sent here to interpret for him and as tribal spokesman.

The CHAIRMAN: That is wonderful. Are you a member of the tribe?

Mr. ATENCIO: I am a member, yes, of the Santo Domingo.

The CHAIRMAN: You are to be commended for the work you are doing, and for this very wonderful speech which you have interpreted for us.

I would like to now ask if any member of the Commission has any questions? First, Dr. Roessel.

Mr. ROESSEL: I know that several years ago the pueblo was trying to get a program, not the oldsters' program but another program, for farm training and expansion of land to be irrigated. What has happened to that at this time?

Mr. AGUILAR: About 3,000 acres of land was rehabilitated through the Bureau of Indian Affairs funds and the OEO—through the OEO, the tribe requested funds to finance farm training, tribal farm training programs, in the early days of 1964, and because they were not or they did not recognize the needs and the problems of our people, it was never funded.

However, through the self-help program, we have started this on a limited basis and the tribal council has assigned land of about 25 acres for demonstration purposes.

Mr. ROESSEL: Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: All right, I will recognize Mr. Davis.

Mr. NEIL DAVIS: Does not the cooperative agriculture extension service, home economics, perform these services of teaching modern farm methods, modern home making, arts and crafts?

Mr. AGUILAR: The tribe has utilized all these resources, but we need to have tools to be able to start anything in the community.

As you know, through the Federal extension agencies, they are limited in time and they must travel 45 miles to the Santo Domingo Pueblo from Albuquerque, so maybe they might spend half a day up there with us.

Mr. NEIL DAVIS: Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Any further questions?

Mr. HENDERSON: How many people make up the Santo Domingo Pueblo?

Mr. ATENCIO: I can answer that for you if I may. It is approximately 3,000 living there.

Mr. HENDERSON: Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, I have just one question on our part.

What are the educational facilities; and are they utilizing some of the programs of OEO?

Mr. ATENCIO: Do you want me to answer that? I believe I can answer it for you if you wish?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, go right ahead, please.

Mr. ATENCIO: We have very limited facilities on the reservation. However, all of the school age children are attending public schools.

But we are trying to do something about the lower grades, because, you know, there is a problem of some dropouts when they reach a certain age level; so through the Headstart program and through the OEO, we have been able to do this for the last year now. I think we have a wonderful program out there.

The CHAIRMAN: Under the Headstart program, just like they do with Mexican Americans—you know, when they first go to school, they are unable to communicate with their counterparts; they cannot communicate with the other students. This is because of a lack of sufficient knowledge of the English language. The Headstart program has been utilized tremendously in the entire Southwest.

The members of the tribe, the first language they know and that they come in contact with, is that still the language of the tribe; it is correct, is it not?

Mr. ATENCIO: Yes, it is; that's true.

The CHAIRMAN: Then the first inkling or, rather, the first knowledge of English language they have then is through the Headstart program?

Mr. ATENCIO: This is the way the tribe teaches them, yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Has it developed well and has it been as successful as it has been in many other parts of the country?

Mr. ATENCIO: We like to feel that it is; but we will not know until probably 5 years from today with some factual evidence.

The CHAIRMAN: It has been in operation for how long?

Mr. ATENCIO: This is the second year now; actually, we are really on the first year.

The CHAIRMAN: All right, any other questions?

Mr. HENDERSON: The Headstart, we have heard that it has had a tremendous impact on the area. Secondly, we have heard about the impact of OEO.

One thing that has run through the whole day has been the impact of OEO in the rural areas in contrast to the traditional Agriculture Department programs.

My query is this: Is it your experience that you have not sufficiently benefited from the traditional Agriculture Department programs? And, if you had to place a priority on it, would you place your priority on the OEO type of operations or would you place the emphasis on the Agriculture Department program?

Mr. ATENCIO: Well, we consider everything under the OEO as part of the overall needs, including the Agriculture Department programs at the Santo Domingo Pueblo.

As a result, that was one of the priorities that our people were concerned about.

Now, we are utilizing the Farmers Home Administration loan program, and by law, they were required to provide some sort of training to those people who borrowed money; but the excuse was that they are very understaffed, so someone has to teach these people how to use their funds in their purchases.

Mr. HENDERSON: What I want to find out from you is where would you place the OEO programs in terms of the impact at the present time, in the sense of the results that OEO is having, in the sense that OEO is meeting the needs of the people there?

Mr. ATENCIO: I am going to have to ask him because I am employed by the tribe and you might think that I am protecting my job.

Mr. HENDERSON: Oh, no, you may answer it; or if you prefer, you may have Mr. Aguilar answer the question.

Mr. AGUILAR: There is no doubt but what the impact through the OEO programs have benefited the tribe, by the utilization of its resources, by bringing the two together, and I might point out that when I went on the job, there was no administrative setup at Santo Domingo because of the lack of funds and the lack of resources. Today, we have this.

Mr. HENDERSON: Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: All right, Mr. Woodenlegs has one question.

Mr. WOODENLEGS: Do individuals have land or is it the tribal land?

Mr. ATENCIO: It is still tribal land; however, the land is assigned to individual members. But it is still tribal land, yes.

Mr. WOODENLEGS: How many acres?

Mr. ATENCIO: Well, the total acreage of the tribe is approximately 72,000 acres, and it is not much. It is just desert land.

Mr. WOODENLEGS: For our tribe of 3,000, we have 425,000 acres. An individual has a right to own land that way. In this way, he can have a right to sell out. But you still have this reservation; and, therefore, the reservation can't be sold out. But an individual can sell back to the tribe.

Mr. ATENCIO: This has been quite a problem for our tribe and our tribal council objects to anything of this sort. However, we have assigned certain lands for use by individuals on our reservation.

The CHAIRMAN: I would like to express, on behalf of the Commission, how grateful we are for your coming here and will you please tell Mr. Aguilar how grateful we are that he was able to come and that we were able to receive the benefit of his recommendations in representing his tribe. Will you please explain that to him?

Mr. ATENCIO: Yes, sir. (Complying.)

Mr. AGUILAR: We are also appreciative of the fact that you people invited us, and this type of thing is necessary, it is a necessary thing that we want to see face to face, bringing out our problems in the same way as you do yours.

We hope that you can do something for our Indian people.

As you know, we had a problem on transportation last night. We couldn't get out of Albuquerque until 3:30 this morning and we arrived here at 5:30, so we have not had any sleep all day, and we did not sleep yesterday.

But we are happy to be here, and I speak on behalf of the tribe.

The CHAIRMAN: We are grateful to both of you for coming. We have learned a great deal from your presentation, both from you, Mr. Atencio, and from Mr. Aguilar.

Mr. ATENCIO: Again, thank you very much on behalf of Mr. Aguilar, the Santo Domingo Pueblo, and myself.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, the Commission would like to recognize Benito Garcia, Sells, Ariz. Mr. Garcia is a Papago Indian.

I would like to say first of all, in reference to Mr. Garcia, that we will be happy to have any type of statement or any type of summary, and if this presentation has been placed in writing, we would like to get it for the record so that we can be sure and make it a part of the testimony, and in that way you could summarize, and yet your full written statement would become a part of the testimony.

Mr. GARCIA: I am very sorry to say at this time that my testimony is going to be somewhat different from the usual testimony here.

I am not going to able to present a typewritten statement; I will only present an oral statement and I beg your forgiveness and tolerance and ask that you try to understand my position here.

The CHAIRMAN: Your oral testimony is being taken down and it will become a part of the record that is actually being prepared for the benefit of the Commission.

Now, you may proceed.

STATEMENT OF BENITO GARCIA

(Presented through an interpreter)

Mr. GARCIA: Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank you very much for your kindness and understanding. I am very happy that you have given me permission to proceed with an oral presentation here.

I did not find out until rather late that I was going to come here to be a witness before this Commission; so I had not too much time for preparation.

But I do want to speak to our poverty situation. I might explain first that I am 72 years of age and, therefore, have seen some life upon the Papago Reservation. Our land is poor, and we have no flowing waters or rivers to speak of, and you know that water is a giver of life.

We are poverty stricken, therefore, because we have very limited amounts of this giver of life. There are, of course, other things which affect our poverty situation on the Papago Reservation.

Our livestock ownership is limited. There are Papagos who own heads of livestock and, therefore, can derive from them an income and a living from that ownership. Others may own other property but this, too, is limited. So you can understand that the Papago people do live in poverty.

Employment is also very scarce on the reservation. We hope always that somehow our government will be able to provide more employment on our reservation so that our people may derive a living from the kind of employment they may get.

As far as education is concerned, here again, education for the Papago has been limited over the years. It was not too many years ago that the educational programs really began to take effect on the Papago Reservation.

I was almost an adult before I discovered the real value of an education. I now feel that only through education can we do certain things; that only through education can our people enable themselves to progress and to improve or not to improve, as a poverty-stricken people.

I believe this so strongly that I speak a lot to the subject in our councils and to our people and to our children, because I believe that this is so.

I pray, therefore, to you that you will understand somehow our situation, that help may be forthcoming.

I understand that you are concerned, that your interest is in this very thing. I certainly hope that, as a result of these hearings, as a result of my coming here and my discussing these things with you, that somehow we may get some better understanding and assistance as a result of this effort.

I say this because I know that we are now being surrounded by people, by different cultures, by different languages, and by different ways of life. Many new things are being introduced to our people and this adds to the complications.

Plans have been introduced. There has been planning, there have been programs; and sometimes it may be good, but sometimes it has not always worked out as plans have been laid.

It is sometimes true that the real benefits of the plans which may have been developed—and programs which may have been implemented have stated as their reasons or as their objectives—have not always turned out as such.

So we have seen over the years times when programs did not quite follow the plans. They have not always accomplished their purpose.

So we need to seek new ways and we need to seek better ways in which to develop these plans; and we need to seek better ways in which to help our people.

Our homes are poor, they need improvement; we need help; because, you see, we seek a better way of life, too.

I believe that the Government has a responsibility to help us; I believe that it is the responsibility of the Government to give us that kind of assistance that we need; to give us the kind of planning; and to give us the kind of programing that will truly help our people—we poor people.

My house is old; it is poor; it is dilapidated; and, in fact, whenever there is a white man in the area, and whenever a white man does come to my house, I am actually ashamed because I have such a poor house. But, you see, this is the situation in which I live; this is the situation in which many of my people live. Therefore, we need the help that I have been asking for.

Many of our people sometimes go out to work in places like Tucson and other places. They work hard. They earn a little money. They must continue to work because they need the help, they need the money.

As we see it at this time, our people will always have to work hard to derive an income with which to get along. Therefore, we need the help from the Government and from programs, and from other sources, wherever we can find the help.

Now I would like to speak to the matter of welfare assistance.

As time went along, the Federal Government finally initiated welfare assistance for our people. There were qualifications to be met as the law provided, but some of our people did begin to receive some welfare benefits from our Government.

On the reservation we have stores, and these stores take every bit of advantage of our welfare recipients. They charge exorbitant prices for what goods they sell to these people who are on welfare. This means that they take every cent from them. These people never have any money that they might have to spend elsewhere.

So it does seem that the local trading store, the local trading post on the reservation, absorbs every bit of that welfare assistance that has been made available to the poor Papagos.

They have benefited from it, but our Papagos had very little money outside of what they have received, and they have given all of this to the stores. They must seek other sources, therefore, to exist—other sources of help in order to survive.

Here they must look to the natural resources of the land. Many of our people are engaged in cutting wood, gathering wood for themselves, and also gathering wood for sale; and again, they must look to the natural resources of our reservation for its sustenance sometimes; but here, here are people with their resourcefulness who have resorted to this and they continue to do this on the Papago Reservation.

Now, with respect to government.

You know, when government came to the Papago Reservation in the form that is usually known to the general American people, it was a new thing to us because we were being introduced here to new patterns of government, and complications set in on the Papago Reservation.

As the new form of government, a new form of law and political system was introduced to our people, we saw many complications in this, as we saw many other avenues for improving our way of life.

Since this involved new law, since it involved a new way of government and a political system, we saw here a great need to find the proper planning and the proper coordination and correlation of the newly introduced system with our old traditional way of government and way of doing things on the Papago Reservation.

It is here that we have experienced some difficulties. But yet, we feel that this perhaps is one of the greatest challenges that we have; that we must somehow find the proper mixture; we must somehow find the proper blending of the new forms which have been introduced to us in our old way of life.

Over the years, we have gotten administrators on the Papago Reservation; superintendents come and go as years go by. We don't always know what their thinking is; they don't always communicate with us.

It seems to me that one of our greatest needs is a better communications system for the Papago people. It seems to me that we need to improve the communication between those people who are sent to the Papago Reservation by the Federal Government to work with the Papago people. We need to improve communications so that we know what their thinking is, so that we know what their wishes are; so that we know what their plans are with respect to what needs to be done on the Papago Reservation. There must be better consultation between them and us.

Also, and perhaps more important than that, since it involves the Papago people that work on the Papago Reservation, we need to be consulted as to our wishes, and as to our ideas of what our needs really are. We feel that we understand what our needs are, if only we could be consulted more. We feel that, on matters that vitally affect us and that vitally affect our livelihood, that vitally affect our people and our lands and everything that is Papago, we ought to be consulted; there ought to be a continual communication and consultation between us if we are going to improve matters on the Papago Reservation.

We also need to be informed; therefore, we need better communication between the Government workers and ourselves.

We just got a new superintendent here a little while ago, and we certainly hope that he will begin a new practice on our reservation, that there will be a better relationship; and most of all, that there will be better communication between us and them. We believe we understand our situation better than anybody else, because we have lived with it; we have lived in poverty; we have lived with the things which are Papago and are a part of our reservation.

Therefore, we feel that we ought to be discussing our own ideas with those people who come to administer matters on the Papago Reservation.

The CHAIRMAN: In that connection, will you please ask Mr. Garcia if he will allow some of the members of the Commission to ask a few questions?

Mr. GARCIA: Yes, I would be very happy to terminate my statement at this time and leave the rest of the time open for questions or discussion.

The CHAIRMAN: First of all, just for the record, may we get Mr. Garcia's position with the Papago Indian Tribe?

Mr. GARCIA: I misunderstood the question. I am sorry, I did not know exactly what you were after so this is the answer to the question as I have it now.

I am a worker of the land and I live on the Papago Reservation; and I am also a member of the district council for my district.

The CHAIRMAN: All right, do you have a question, Mr. Gay?

Mr. GAY: I have a brief statement that I would like translated to Mr. Garcia, and I believe I speak for the members of this Commission when I say this.

Mr. Garcia may be poor in the material things of life; but I feel that God has bestowed upon him a wealth untold—a wealth of wisdom, understanding, and compassion. I feel that Mr. Garcia's wealth in these things is greater than the wealth of most of the members of this Commission. I just wanted to be certain that Mr. Garcia knew how we felt.

Mr. GARCIA: I thank the members of this Commission.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions?

Mr. GIBSON: Just a couple of questions. Could you give us the size of the population of the Papago Reservation?

Mr. GARCIA: My understanding is that there are something like 14,000 Papagos. There are something like 7,000 Papagos on the reservation at this time; and the other members of the population are off the reservation in various types of employment.

They are poor so they go out and seek employment wherever they can find it, so there are about that many on the reservation at this time.

The CHAIRMAN: Any other questions?

Mr. GIBSON: I have just one or two more, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: All right, Mr. Gibson.

Mr. GIBSON: These will be my last questions.

I am interested to know if you have any programs on the reservation—any OEO programs, community action programs, any Headstart programs; or the Neighborhood Youth Corps; and if they are active, and if you have Papago staffing of those programs?

Mr. GARCIA: We have some difficulty in understanding the question, and also of being aware of the programs, the community action programs, because we are not familiar with the programs per se. There are some of these type of programs, and I am sure that they are improving the plight of the Papagos.

The CHAIRMAN: Dr. Roessel, do you have a question?

Mr. ROESSEL: Could I ask if you could tell us what the community action programs are, what programs there are under the community action programs, and could you tell us briefly the programs and your feeling about them, what you know about them?

Mr. GARCIA: The community action programs that are now in existence on the Papago Reservation is a program for 4- and 5-year-olds, and they are OEO funded—well, not funded, but it began through OEO before the establishment of the summer Headstart program.

These were determined on a survey that was conducted among the Papago people as to what their needs were, and it was explained to them the Economic Opportunity Act, and what they were entitled to, where people were given the opportunity to discuss their needs and to request funds for their basic needs where there was an opportunity for the people themselves to determine their needs, or to help determine their needs, and to administer in relation to these needs.

The request came or the interest came for this early program of education, so we do have this program.

Also, there is a remedial reading program for those who are now in schools, technical schools, which complement the existing school program.

There is a high rate of illiteracy of the English language among our Papago people. There is also a high percentage of school dropouts and we feel that is because of our handicap with the English language. The remedial language program consists of a school teacher who, in the earlier grades—for instance, grades one through four devote their time to the English language; and then in the upper grades, they devote their time to the subject content and reading, and this takes second place.

We have the Neighborhood Youth Corps and this has shown to be a good program for the youth on the reservation.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps enables our youth to work on the Papago Reservation. Prior to this, many of them stayed off the reservation in the communities where the schools were located, such as Phoenix, Ariz.; Riverside, Calif.; and Stewart, Nev.; and other off-reservation communities.

We have two programs which have not yet been funded, and one of these is the community development program where we hope to have funds available where people can work together; and the other component of this program is set up for legal services.

The CHAIRMAN: Did you say legal services?

Mr. GARCIA: That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN: All right. Are there any other questions by any members of the Commission? (No response.)

Now, I would request that the interpreter express to Mr. Garcia the gratitude first of the members of the Commission for his attendance; and for giving us the benefit of his testimony this afternoon.

(Interpreter complying.)

Also, we express our thanks equally to the two interpreters.

Mr. GARCIA: Thank you, gentlemen, very much.

The CHAIRMAN: And we all thank you very much, sir.

Now, the Commission will recognize Mrs. Mamie Sizemore, Indian education consultant of the Division of Indian Education, Arizona State Department of Public Instruction, Phoenix, Ariz.

Before Mrs. Sizemore begins, we would alert Mr. Edward Samora, and Mr. Raul Rodriquez, and Dr. Willard Abraham, and Mr. Lee Lukson.

It is getting quite late and we want to get today's program completed as soon as possible.

All right, Mrs. Sizemore, you may proceed.

STATEMENT OF MAMIE SIZEMORE

Mrs. SIZEMORE: My name is Mamie Sizemore. I am a consultant in the Division of Indian Education, State Department of Public Instruction, 1333 West Camelback, Phoenix, Ariz.

My subject is "Closing the Gap in Indian Education." I would like to quote Shirley Marcen, Adams State College, Alamosa, Colo., in 1964, and she said:

> Education is only a tool and it alone cannot solve all problems, but it can help the American Indian to be independent, walk straight, and stand tall.

The school year 1965-66 has developed a different orientation to the formulation of guidelines for Indian education. This orientation renders former guidelines inadequate and has necessitated a new framework as a context for this year's annual report. This was made necessary when Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall promised "a new period in the history of the Bureau of Indian Affairs." His plans encompassed greater emphasis on education of Indian children. Included in the changes was the appointment of Robert Bennett, an Oneida Indian from Wisconsin, who is the first Indian to hold the office of Commissioner of Indian Affairs since 1869. Bennett is encouraging greater participation of Indian parents in school affairs.

Just how the Arizona Division of Indian Education will confront new opportunities for improved education for Indian students is yet to be evaluated. Senator Paul Fannin of Arizona recently raised the question whether Indian education might be placed in the hands of the State. He believes the Federal Government should pay the bill, and the State-Federal program be administered through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Democrat administration has maintained an open mind on this proposal. Many complications beset such a proposal. How would this help or hinder the opportunity for Arizona to assume a leadership role in establishing guidelines for new ideas in Indian education? This should be given a great amount of serious thought and advanced planning.

What will be the role of the Arizona Division of Indian Education in helping speed the day of Indian self-sufficiency in this "new period" of Indian education? Services of the Division must be tailored to stimulate and assist in this educational change which should be held back only by the limits of each district's own inventiveness and creativity and its willingness to learn from the failures and successes of past experiences.

Monies from the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 were made available to schools. This program helped local school districts enrich the curriculum not only for Indian students but for all students. Each program was tailored to the specific needs of each community and designed to make optimum use of the community's educational resources. A few of the innovative ideas are listed below:

(1) After-school study areas.
(2) Language laboratories for special equipment and special personnel.
(3) Exemplary educational radio and television programs.
(4) Visiting teacher services.
(5) Reading centers.
(6) Guidance and counseling services.
(7) School health services.
(8) Experimental or exemplary preschool programs.
(9) Adult education centers.
(10) Mobile science laboratories.
(11) Improved library services.
(12) Arts and crafts centers.
(13) Special education classes.
(14) Psychological services (not before possible).
(15) Multipurpose youth centers.
(16) Centralized teaching facilities—concentrated on teaching certain subjects.
(17) Use of Indian teacher aids.
(18) Team teaching.
(19) Bookmobile.
(20) Better planned and longer field trips.

Indian Education in 1965

Indian children attend public, Federal, private, and mission schools. In fiscal year 1965 there were 134,064 Indian students, ages 6 to 18 years inclusive, enrolled in these schools in the United States. Compared to 132,654 students last year, enrollment increased 1.1 percent. There are approximately 33,000 Indian students enrolled in public, Federal, and mission schools in Arizona. This number broken down is as follows: public, 13,000; Federal, 17,000; mission, 3,000.

During the year 1961 the Bureau dropped from its school census of Indian school children those residing in the States of California, Idaho, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, Oregon (except the Warm Springs Agency), Texas, Washington, and Wisconsin, where responsibility for the education of their Indian school children had previously been accepted by the States.

In 1965, more than half (55.1 percent) of all Indian children of school age attended public schools. Of those enrolled in school, 61.4 percent (6.3 percent over 18 and under 6) attended public schools, 32.2 percent attended Federal schools, and 6.4 percent attended mission and other schools. Comparable percentages in 1964 were 59.8, 33.3, and 6.9.

For more than three centuries Indian education in the United States was largely under the direction of missionaries. As early as 1568, the Jesuit Fathers organized a school at Havana, Cuba, for Indian children from Florida. This was the first school attended by Indian children who lived within the United States.

Many of the treaties between the United States and Indian tribes provided for the establishment of schools for Indian children. Congress has also provided schools for Indian children where other educational facilities were not available. In 1842, there were 37 Indian schools in operation and by 1881 the number had increased to 106. In 1965, the Bureau of Indian Affairs operated 258 schools with an enrollment of 48,050 Indian children, and 19 dormitories for 4,221 children attending public schools.

Indian children are entitled to the same opportunities for public school education as are provided for other citizens living within a State. It is encouraging to note that the States have assumed responsibility for the education of 82,302 or 55.1 percent of school age Indian children in the States where the Bureau of Indian Affairs has direct educational responsibility. Over one-third are educated at no cost to the Bureau of Indian Affairs. In some States, however, tax-exempt, Indian-owned lands and large numbers of Indian children within a school district may create financial burdens for which local funds are inadequate. As early as 1890, contracts providing for financial assistance to schools attended by Indian children were negotiated with individual districts. It was recognized then, as today, that Indian children become better adjusted to living with all people in a community when they associate with other children in public schools. The Johnson-O'Malley Act, which became law in 1934, authorized the Secretary of the Interior to enter into contracts with States for the education of Indians and to permit the use of Federal school buildings and equipment by local school authorities. Consequently, some States with large Indian populations now have no Federal schools within their boundaries.

Under the terms of Public Law 874, 81st Congress (64 Stat. 1100), as amended August 13, 1958, administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, a new Federal aid resource was made available to eligible school districts educating Indian children. This aid is available to meet partial costs of normal school operation. Additional supplemental aid for the education of Indian children under the Johnson-O'Malley program is limited to districts that do not qualify under the Public Law 874 program and to districts meeting educational problems under extraordinary circumstances, including special services and special programs designed to facilitate the education of Indian children.

In fiscal year 1965, the Bureau of Indian Affairs entered into contracts with 14 States and with school districts in 3 other States, in accordance with approved plans which specify conditions under which financial aid is extended. In addition to these, aid was provided through contracts for the education in public schools of

2,379 out-of-district Indian children living in dormitories operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs in seven towns adjacent to the Navajo Reservation, and in Albuquerque, N. Mex.

Congressional appropriations to the Bureau of Indian Affairs are limited to the education of children of one-fourth or more degree of Indian blood and native children in Alaska, except for the Cherokee Agency where children of less than one-quarter degree of Indian blood enrolled in the tribe may attend Federal schools. In Alaska this includes Indian, Eskimo, and Aleut. One hundred specific tribes or tribal groups and Aleuts, Eskimos, and various tribes of Indians in Alaska were represented in the 1965 school census.

Nature of Educational Problem

It is recognized by the educators of Arizona that the Indian people of the State are in a transitional stage. They are torn between their own ancient standards and those which are urged upon them by the non-Indians they contact. An appreciable number of Indian children become confused by the conflicting precepts of their elders and their non-Indian models so that they tend, in effect, to reject the whole problem of acculturation as meaningless, or insoluble. The majority of Arizona Indians no longer feel completely at home or at ease in their native world of values and are still unable to accept without reservations the values and ethics of white society.

The teacher who looks, perhaps unconsciously, with scorn upon Indian values and attempts to implant his own notions of success, who makes the student dissatisfied with every element of his Indian life without offering a way out that is possible of achievement, builds a gulf between the student and his people, and leaves him in some no man's land, neither Indian nor non-Indian.

A growing number of Indian leaders and educators view separate systems of education as reducing rather than enhancing an Indian child's opportunity to become a part of American society on equal terms with his neighbor. In light of this changing viewpoint, it is pertinent to ask how the public schools can meet this challenge and help provide the background for successful assimilation.

In the United States, public education has long been an important agent in the cultural assimilation of immigrant groups in American life. Today, it has a similarly important function for the oldest American group of all—the American Indian. Arizona Indians are slowly increasing in number. Sixty percent of Arizona Indian children come from homes where no English is spoken. Their lives are a curious mixture of old and new: of riding on half-wild shaggy ponies and big yellow buses; of tribal feasts and Coca-Cola; of Corn Dances and Mother's Day. What can be done by teachers to prevent Indian children from being overwhelmed in a public school environment?

Many factors must determine the program stressed in public schools where Indian children are enrolled. These factors reside within the pupils themselves, the parents, the teachers, the schoolrooms, and the community. The elements within each of these supposedly disparate entities should together influence the formulation and implementation of the instructional program in the schools of the State. There are two fundamental objectives that, in practice, are so interrelated that it is difficult to say which should be given precedence when in a written statement. The first is the development of the ability to communicate in the language; this at first glance would seem the most important to the classroom teacher. The second is the fostering of an insight into the cultural patterns and social values of the country whose language is being studied. The findings of research tend to prove that cultural factors can actually control the learning process more than individual ability. It has been said that it is much easier to lose a linguistic accent than a cultural one.

Acculturation is many times accompanied by emotional instability because of children's natural love for his family. It can be retarded by the family's loyalty to tribal traditions and fear of the new way of life. The school plays a major role in the acculturation of Indian-speaking children. As the school teaches a new language, it also must teach new behaviors to take the place of the ones learned in the child's own culture.

English is learned most readily when English is spoken—not in segregated schools. Children must feel secure in the practice of the new skill by much encouragement of its use. Need must be felt for the new language—to express an idea. To thank a friend for a favor, to ask for one's turn to take a ball out to the playground, are real and vital situations to the young child and call for use of English.

Forbidding the use of the native language is not only ineffective but may create resistance and an emotional block which could cause retardation in the rate of learning the new language. The wise teacher, then, will create situations which will require the use of oral English instead of hushing the child who speaks in his native tongue. Through active participation in the democratic environment, that all schools should provide, the Indian child will be helped not only to learn to speak English but to adjust to the way of life that is every American's heritage.

The cultural isolation of Arizona Indians cannot be broken down easily. Many factors cause this isolation. To name a few: a low economic status, location of reservations, bad roads, tribal customs, rejection by the majority group, segregated housing, and schooling. The school cannot deal directly with many of these problems; they are beyond the scope of its authority. By helping children and adults to recognize and assume the responsibilities and privileges as citizens in a democratic society, and the skills in using the techniques of democracy, the school will fulfill its role in the acculturation of Arizona Indians.

Teachers must understand the traditions of the Indian group with whom they are working, always bearing in mind that all Indians do not have the same cultural background, and that traditions vary from tribe to tribe. The schools of Arizona have to educate, therefore, not Indians of common background, but sheep-raising Navajo, who must learn to utilize and conserve their ranges for an unlimited future; village-dwelling Hopi, whose culture is better adapted to simple mesa and desert living than anything white man has yet devised, but who need to understand the dominant culture's technical and health advancements which can be adapted to their present society; Apache, whose now suppressed seminomadic and raiding habits have left their lives empty of the old satisfactions, and who must change from the hunting of wild animals to the raising of domesticated animals; Papago, who must adjust a rapidly increasing population and cattle industry to restricted and eroded lands by new methods of irrigation and cultivation; Pima, once subsistence farmers who are now faced with great commercial farming opportunities and an efficient and technically advanced irrigation system; Colorado River tribes, who practiced originally very little, if any, agriculture, and were the least advanced in cultural development of Arizona Indians, and suffered more from encroachment of white civilization, and yet are now living in a semidependence on this civilization.

Each of these groups has its own system of social relationship and social controls, by which it maintains its group as well as carries on its economic system. Each has met non-Indian culture in its own way, improving its life with what it has selected from this culture or finding social and personal disorganization as the result of economic change.

Social structures within each tribe should be understood by Arizona educators. Do not have the idea that all Indians love each other, or that they all are thought as equals by their tribal brothers. The Indian-speaking child in your classroom may not have heard English spoken until he enters school or he may only speak his native language, as a show of respect, with his grandparents. His home may be a hogan, a wickiup, or a well-furnished modern house. He may eat fried bread, a widely advertised cereal for his breakfast, or come to school without breakfast. He may go with his parents when they migrate to the vegetable fields, or he may live all his life in one neighborhood. He may go with his mother to a supermarket, in the newest model pickup or car; or he may travel slowly to the nearest trading post, by a wagon drawn by two underfed horses.

The Indian child of Arizona may listen to fables and tribal stories told by his grandparents, or he may listen to stories read from carefully selected books by his college-educated parents. He may listen to off-color stories told around the campfire in a migratory farm labor camp. The social and economic backgrounds of Indian children differ as much as those of children that are born and reared in the homes of other American children. This should always be kept in mind by teachers when planning their curriculum. Boys and girls with these differences in life problems, different environments and societies, cannot enter into a single curriculum equally, nor derive equal benefit from it.

Arizona Indians

Arizona has a larger number of full-blooded Indians than does any other State. In 1960, the Indian population of Arizona was estimated to be near 100,000. This is one-fifth of all the Indians in the nation. The remarkable element in the history of Arizona Indians has been their long spatial and social isolation which has led to a slow-changing cultural pattern in most tribes. Indians of Arizona continue to speak their own language and hold to old social and religious customs.

The major contributing factor to the upsurge in Indian interest in education, and the breakdown of this isolation, was World

War II. This event took many of the Indians away from their reservations to serve in the Armed Forces, or to work in industrial areas. After observing the advantages of an education to other Americans, the Indians returned to their reservations to spark a demand for more educational advantages for their own children.

Of growing importance has been the effect produced by the building and improvement of reservation roads. This, plus modern modes of transportation and communication, has brought most Arizona Indians into contact with the dominant culture. While all tribes are making adjustments to this culture, there are great differences in the speed of acculturation and the degree with which each selects or rejects new ideas.

It is difficult for the average person to realize that we cannot speak of Indians as a single group. Arizona's Indian tribes may differ from each other even more than Americans differ from the Chinese or Russians. An Apache, for example, has the same difficulty understanding the behavior of a Pima, or a Hualapai, as does the average non-Indian.

Indians of today recognize, in theory at least, the value of education, modern medicine, and the American economic system. This recognition has not reached the stage, only in individual cases, where the desire for education will overcome all obstacles for its attainment. The medicine man is still a powerful force in some tribes. The American economic system—thrift, saving, private property concepts, capital investment—makes little if any sense to many Arizona Indians.

One of the most difficult things for teachers of Indian children in Arizona to realize is that Indians are a diverse people. When the name Indian is applied to all Arizona tribes, we lose sight of the fact that the term covers a greater number of races and cultural groups than most people know. When the word "European" or "Asiatic" is used, we immediately think of many different races. The word "Indian" should be used in the same sense. Teachers should then have a basis for a clear comparison of the 14 or 15 linguistic and cultural groups that make up our Arizona tribes. The more teachers know about Indian children and their background, the better they are equipped to understand and be of help in their educational efforts.

Cultural Factors in Social Adjustment

We must remember Indian tribes are no longer culturally homogeneous and for this reason behavior is not predictable on the basis of a knowledge of true aboriginal patterns. But whoever has observed the behavior of many Papago in possession of cash knows that, at least ninety times out of a hundred, the Papago will spend most of his money at once at the trader's, at a fiesta, or in town. For him, money's essential value seems to lie in its conversion into pleasure and into the satisfaction of immediate needs. It usually provides prestige only in the form of a particularly beautiful saddle, or occasionally in a car, a radio, a television, or a sewing machine; seldom is it accumulated. Money for a Papago child, as for his elders, gives him the gratification of meeting his present needs. After urgent needs have been satisfied, money is used chiefly to obtain the sort of pleasure specific to old Papago culture, wholehearted and complete relaxation after the tension of work. Here the desires and the needs of an ancient culture are met with the tools of a recently introduced, alien socioeconomic and cultural system.

The Navajo tribe is the largest tribe in Arizona. Some of them do have a great drive to get rich, and one must ask how much of this is due to non-Indian influence, but the majority seem to be interested only in meeting immediate needs. This to many teachers makes them seem "utterly without ambition." Navajos will sometimes say, "All we want is enough to eat for ourselves and our families." What is not said but is often implied by context or in other ways is that life is so dangerous and terrible and so many things can happen to people, that anyone is foolish to ask for more than immediate security. Hence, for many of the tribe, the predominant drive is for moderate material well-being.

Thus, possessions for many Indians are valued both as providing security and as affording opportunities for mild ostentation. But to take the attainment of riches as the chief aim of life is universally condemned. Following is a typical pronouncement by an old Navajo leader:

> The Navajo way is just to want enough to have enough to eat for your family and nice things to wear sometimes. We don't like it when nowadays some of these young men marry rich girls for their money and waste it all right away. The old people say this is wrong. You can't get rich if you look after your relatives right. You can't get rich without cheating some people. Cheating people is the wrong way. That way gets you into trouble. Men should be honest to get along.

Obligations toward one's own relatives become particularly difficult for a Navajo in business. In one of the Navajo enterprises, the Navajo foreman was "unable" to discharge any Navajo workman, no matter how inefficient. The reason is plain. Navajo communities kept the peace in the past by an unwritten law of good will, even toward the lazy and the quarrelsome. The foreman, neither an elder nor a relative to the workman, could not risk his standing in the community by an act of aggression. Even more difficult is the lot of the Navajo policeman who, on occasion, must arrest not only fellow Navajo but his own relatives. The suicide of one policeman is attributed to this cause.

As to hard work, one frequently hears the Arizona Indian accused of being lazy, shiftless, and incompetent. If one were to gather together the cartoons about Indians published by magazines and newspapers in the United States over a period of only one year, the majority of these would be found to surround this general non-Indian assumption that Indians are basically lazy and do nothing they can escape doing.

There is no denying that many Indians are lazy, but so are many people of any race. Many modern Indians have found life pointless and without purpose and, as a result, many of them doubtless have accepted the line of least resistance and make little or no effort. An Indian wants, as the non-Indian does, to know that what he is doing is of some use. He must feel that he is producing something of actual value in the life he is living. He may feel, like the farmer, that he is producing something of vital value. Or he may have the officeworker's desired stimulus: an interesting job, with hopes of getting to the top. Or, like the businessman or the politician, he may take satisfaction in planning and directing a project of his own. Indian or white men who have none of these stimuli are frequently loafers. The energy of the Indian as well as that of the non-Indian worker is likely to be in direct ratio to his interest in the job he is doing and his conviction of its worth to him or to others.

To many Arizona Indians work is not, as it is in Puritan tradition, a good thing in itself. Their values do not lead the individual to consider work in itself as a virtue or as a source of personal prestige. Wage work, in their eyes, is a means to an end; and the few things that an unacculturated Indian might buy seldom have sufficient attraction to move him to seek a higher income by way of year-round jobs which call for unbroken sequence of workdays.

Indian conception of space and time are hopelessly confusing from the point of view of members of the dominant society. To people familiar with the Indian country, they know an "Indian mile" may mean a mile, 500 years, or 5 miles.

Anthropologists report that language is the essence of culture. There are no people anywhere known to be without a language, and the language always includes expressions to describe those things that are considered important to the people speaking that language. In the Sioux and many other Indian languages, there is no word for time.

Both "time" and "space" affect the behavior of everyone in Western culture. Time, especially, causes us to be oriented toward calendars, dates, "the course of history," timetables, clocks, time wages, race against time, accounting, compound interest, actuarial statistics, annals, diaries, the age of rocks, of the earth, of the solar system, of the universe. The book of Genesis gets the cosmos launched in 4004 B.C. Time impels us to look ahead in planning programs, schedules, appropriations, balanced budgets. Our love affair with time causes other cultures whose languages permit a less hurried outlook, as the American Indian, to regard us as somewhat mad.

People that work with Indians are often heard to complain, "Indians have no idea of the meaning of time." "Pretty soon" may be in 10 minutes or 10 hours. This is also true of many rural non-Indians—their lives are less hurried than the city dweller. Most people, however, are time conscious, from the time they are infants fed on schedule until they come to their final resting place.

Modern-day Indians are discovering the importance of "clock time" in getting along in life away from the reservations, and many who cannot read or write have learned to tell time. If a job is important to an Indian and he cannot depend on "sun time," he will often arrive an hour early. This has been found to be true of Indian children who really want to come to school.

An interesting and amusing article appeared recently in which the author made the point that many cultures worshipped certain gods publicly and other gods privately. In American culture, he pointed out, many of us avow Christianity and publicly worship Jehovah, whereas an even larger proportion of us actually worship the pagan god TIME. This he proceeded to prove, by pointing out that most of us wore the symbol of TIME in amulet form as a wristwatch, or a pocketpiece. Each home of a TIME worshipper has an icon, with a clock as the godhead. TIME worshippers consult their oracle frequently throughout the day and sometimes throughout the night, especially when planning anything of importance. In all of this, we treat the god TIME with the same ceremony that an aborigine observes in respecting or regarding whatever fetish or symbol is part of his cultural background. The article, of course, was a satire, and the author had his tongue in his cheek. However, he unconsciously pointed out a contrast between Indian and non-Indian culture, which is an important consideration for educators.

We are a "time-worshipping" civilization. This is so obvious to us that we never stop to think that it may not be equally as obvious to Indian children. We realize that TIME is not the most desirable of our deities, but anyone who is to succeed in the everyday industrial life has to recognize that he must rule his life by TIME. Anyone who fails to do so has trouble fitting successfully into our culture.

There are probably no others quite like us in this respect. We have taken the recurring four seasons of the year and divided the cycle into 365 days and each of these by a clock into 24 hours, each hourly unit into minutes, and each of these further into 60 seconds. And currently in our atomic age, we find that even the segmentation of this phenomenon we call time to the smallest degree is not yet small enough; in the language of the atomic scientists a period of time called a jiffy is useful in their calculations—a jiffy being the length of time it takes an object moving at the speed of light to travel a distance of 1 centimeter. When we think of light traveling at the rate 186,300 miles per second and a centimeter as being a little less than two-thirds of an inch, we can get some slight hint of the refinements of time in our life today.

All this represents a cultural acceptance of a factor in life that is foreign to Indian thinking or Indian experience. The sun has been his alarm clock, the seasons furnished a calendar of sorts, which dictated when to plant and harvest crops and when to hunt. The weather controlled the growth of his crops and the movement of the animals, not man-made time. Scanning the research that has been done on the subject reveals that there were no North American indigenous cultures where people did the same thing from morning to night, day after day, year after year. If a job that their existence depended upon had to be done, it was done intensively for many hours, or many consecutive days. When it was finished the workers might rest, or dance, or play, or celebrate in one way or another, in the period before the next important job had to be done.

But the moment an Indian comes in contact for any period of time with non-Indians, all this changes. The small Indian child entering school is expected to be there at a certain hour in the morning, his schoolday is regulated by a bell geared to a clock, he returns home at a set time each afternoon. He is judged not "socially acceptable" and is a poor school citizen if he is tardy or absent often without an acceptable excuse.

One of the easiest things in the world is to condemn people for being different from what is currently "socially acceptable" without understanding or, if possible, appreciating the reason for the differences. Do teachers stop to think or try to find out by firsthand observation why their children are not time conscious? There is a story that tells of a teacher of Indian children who passed away after a nervous breakdown. On her tombstone was inscribed:

HERE RESTS MRS. JONES. SHE TRIED TO HURRY THE NAVAJO.

There is a lesson to be learned from this story that should be of value to educators of Indian children. They should understand why the child is the way he is, before starting to pour him into the mold that has been set up as desirable for a good school citizen in non-Indian society.

A big difficulty in running a school where many Indian children are enrolled is the fact that many of the families do not have clocks to enable them to coordinate the rising and feeding of the children with the arrival of the school bus which is to take them to school. It would then become clear that one of the first things which must happen to Indian children who are expected to adjust to school life, is to become oriented to the importance of our clockwork civilization. Emphasis must be placed on the importance of time in non-Indian culture, and this brought to the children in actual lifelike classroom activities. Early in his school career the child should be taught to tell time. In a classroom of Apache first graders the teacher was talking to a guest when from the back of the room exploded the word, "Recess." This child had found a definite need for knowing how to tell time. Recess was a very important time of day for him.

Making the child time conscious is easier than doing the same thing for his parents. It would be interesting to see what could be accomplished by a dozen inexpensive clocks, in Indian homes, to promote in the families the regularity which educators consider important.

School administrators have a difficult time getting the correct age of Indian students. Navajos, especially, remember seasons of the year and sequence of events rather accurately. It is on absolute dates that they become confused. A Navajo mother always knows the order of the birth of her children. She can tell you whether a child was born when there was snow on the ground or when the feed for the sheep was green. But she may insist that her oldest child is 14 years old and a younger one 16. Children being born on reservations today have their births recorded at agency headquarters. Teachers wishing to verify a birth date may do this by writing or calling the seat of tribal government of the tribe to which the child belongs.

The time spent in seeking to understand those with whom one must work is usually well invested. It will help to avoid misunderstanding if one respects the life patterns of others, which are as integral a part of their cultural patterns as one's own habits are of one's own social group. Incidentally, many disciplinary difficulties in the class will disappear, for apparent disobedience will appear frequently as a different manner of reacting to a common situation. Apparent discourtesies often will turn into demonstrations of respect—in the manner of another culture. Indian children will be found to be even more desirous of "getting on" with teachers than a similar number of white children.

Indian children do not differ from non-Indian youngsters in any of the fundamentals of behavior. However, they have grown up from infancy in different manners. Their taboos are likely to be different, and the standards of conduct will at first conform to those of their fathers and mothers. Teachers should be aware of this from the first day of the school year.

Manuelito, a famous Navajo war chief said:

> My grandchild, the whites have many things which we Navajos need, but we cannot get them. It is as though the whites were in a grassy canyon and there they have wagons, plows, and plenty of food. We Navajos are up on the dry mesa. We can hear them talking but we cannot get to them. My grandchild, education is the ladder. Tell our people to take it.

Closing the Educational Gap

(1) The schools which Indian students attend—Federal, public, and mission—should offer the best curricula, programs, teaching methods, and guidance employed in educating all students. The quality of the instruction they receive and its adaption to their needs is of prime importance.

(2) The training offered should be built on the strength of Indian students rather than on their weakness.

(3) The Indian community and tribal, local, and government officials should be included in all educational planning.

(4) The teaching staff of all schools teaching Indian students should be qualified in their field of specialization, but should also know the cultural background of their students.

(5) The standards should not be lowered in any school to accommodate Indian students, but should be geared to their needs. Special remedial measures should be taken to close the educational gap, not lowered standards.

(6) The Indian child should be allowed to live at home whenever possible. His individual age, his emotional adjustment, and the circumstances of his home life should be considered before he is taken away from his parents to be educated.

(7) The people who work with Indian students, not just teachers, should have special training and be adequately compensated for their efforts. This includes bus drivers, dormitory attendants, and teacher aids.

(8) The counseling of Indian students should continue from elementary school through college.

(9) The education of adults should be strengthened. The Indian tribes should take action to require parents to keep their children in school.

(10) The tribes and government should provide adequate grants for higher education. This should include vocational training as well as college grants.

(11) The provision for economic improvement must go hand in hand with education.

(12) The Indian himself must be aware of his social, economic, and educational problems. The effectiveness of any program depends on the involvement of the Indian people in the solution of their own problems.

I want to thank the members of this Commission for allowing me to make this presentation here today.

The CHAIRMAN: Mrs. Sizemore, we certainly do appreciate your remarks.

Are there any questions now from any of the members of the Commission? (No response.)

I think it is a wonderful and eloquent dissertation that you have

INDIAN AND SPANISH-SURNAME POPULATION IN ARIZONA, BY COUNTIES, APRIL 1960

County	Total population	Indian population		Population with Spanish surname		Total Indian and Spanish-surname population	
	Number	*Number*	*Percent*	*Number*	*Percent*	*Number*	*Percent*
Apache	30,438	22,814	75.0	1,033	3.4	23,847	78.4
Cochise	55,039	108	0.2	13,764	25.0	13,872	25.2
Coconino	41,857	11,668	27.9	4,341	10.4	16,009	38.3
Gila	25,745	3,513	13.6	5,633	21.9	9,146	35.5
Graham	14,045	1,249	8.9	2,355	16.8	3,604	25.7
Greenlee	11,509	182	1.6	5,238	45.5	5,420	47.1
Maricopa	663,510	8,136	1.2	78,996	11.9	87,132	13.1
Mohave	7,736	727	9.4	630	8.1	1,357	17.5
Navajo	37,994	19,324	50.9	2,604	6.9	21,928	57.8
Pima	265,660	7,307	2.8	44,481	16.7	51,788	19.5
Pinal	62,673	5,760	9.2	17,343	27.7	23,103	36.9
Santa Cruz	10,808	17	0.2	6,222	57.6	6,239	57.8
Yavapai	28,912	780	2.7	2,403	8.3	3,183	11.0
Yuma	46,235	1,802	3.9	9,313	20.1	11,115	24.0
TOTAL	1,302,161	83,387	6.4	194,356	14.9	277,743	21.3

Source: U.S. Dept. Commerce, Bur. of Census: United States Census of Population, 1960.

made, and I know that we have a record of it, Mrs. Sizemore. We certainly do thank you for being with us and for being patient in waiting so long in order to make your appearance. We are running very late and we do have some other speakers. But you certainly do have our thanks, the thanks of every member of this Commission.

Mrs. **SIZEMORE**: Thank you.

The **CHAIRMAN**: All right, we will now hear from Mr. Edward Samora, the State director of the League of United Latin American Citizens. This organization is known as LULAC. He is from Mesa, Ariz., and he will speak on "Education, Training and Problems of Mexican-Americans."

Mr. Samora, are you ready to make your presentation?

Mr. **SAMORA**: Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman.

The **CHAIRMAN**: All right, you may proceed.

STATEMENT OF EDWARD SAMORA, JR.

Mr. **SAMORA**: I am Edward Samora, Jr., LULAC State director.

I have presented a booklet entitled "Operation SER," which will accompany my presentation.

Rural poverty in the Southwest is unique in that it is largely represented by peoples who do not speak out for themselves. Language barrier is not the only problem for the Mexican-American fieldworker who might wish to voice some objection to low wages in seasonal employment. He is by culture not a dissenter but rather of an acceptance nature. Reticent and kind by nature, he is thankful for the necessities of life and when they are no longer forthcoming from his labors he is bewildered and alone and can then move into a welfare-oriented society from which there is little escape except, in many instances, the cheap wine that blots out the vision of his children following his path.

Training programs for job betterment sound impressive but have been cruel. Recruitment, screening, and the long wait; then comes the training for nonexistent jobs and, consequently, disillusionment. He can go back, for instance, to tomato picking at 25 cents per box so that for five 10-hour days he will earn from $32.50 to $37.50, but the bracero will have made $50 per week with the security of the guarantee of a job and housing from the time he crossed the border.

The Mexican-American worker needs the whole book when we speak of benefits; better working conditions, better housing and sanitation facilities, unemployment compensation, and enforcement of child labor laws to keep the children in school and out of the field, for while the school records may show 7 years' attendance the reading equivalency is second grade. We might take the example of the electronics industry. The Mexican-American women with fieldworker background report for adaptability test. Highly dexterous and fast with their hands, they test out well except they cannot read the simple instructions or relate simple reports. To quote an interviewer from the employment commission, "Why bother; this is too cruel and frustrating." So back to the fields they go.

Could it be that education or manpower development by necessity would have to exert more effort in training the truly unskilled? Certainly they would have stayed in school; but the eating habit takes priority over education when your work is needed to feed the family and, after all, fieldwork does pay by the day and affords quick cash. The classes move ahead and the Mexican American falls back; then they are totally lost—so many marry at 15 and 16 and give up and accept poverty. In one Maricopa County community, 98 percent of a quota of 40 of the NYC high school dropouts were Mexican Americans who on screening related pretty well the same story: English at school, Spanish at home, no one to encourage them at home, when you don't understand you lose interest, no money for lunch, the others have better clothes, I had a baby or we got married—he was 16, I was 15—he doesn't have a job except when they hire on the farms and we live with my folks. This is not a pretty picture and the remedy may be expensive from basic training to skilled training, but the cost of the most ambitious programs would be small in comparison to the ever-growing welfare cost developing for the future.

The bulk of the American Indian population is in the Southwest, long told by a paternalistic Government what to do and how to do it. With inadequate training, they migrate to the cities to try the urban labor market. Relegated to slum areas they cannot, in the main, cope with the problems of urban society. Why do they retreat to an overcrowded reservation when they have some education and skills? I would say, for the very human reason that if one is to be a second-class citizen, living under miserable conditions, it is better to be at home with friends and neighbors in an atmosphere of common understanding.

I find no solution for this problem which has confounded the experts for several generations at a cost of untold millions, but I would like to offer one suggestion or thought as it were—let him speak out for himself and not be stopped from voicing his opinions. Basically, a proud and resourceful people who survived under conditions that would have destroyed others, should they not have a right to attack the establishment or system that has tended to destroy their moral fiber and stifle all ambition? Is it just to deprive them of the right to seek their solutions to their problems?

Every disadvantaged home has scars on its doorstep and on ours, the hinges are squeaking and there is no one to oil them. We have no cure or solution but do believe it does not lie in the highly professional reports of statistics and forms that would computerize social problems. The basic down-to-earth proposals get filed away in File 13. May we go on with realistic programs for trained manpower appealing to the dignity and intelligence of the people to be served. Could we come out of the clouds and stop dreaming of the hydroelectric plant to generate electricity for rural electrification when we are dealing with people who are thinking in terms of a job to earn that sack of flour to feed the kids.

Are we to forget the elderly, isolated and alone, of the rural Southwest who do not even have knowledge of the agencies created to serve them much less the use of such agencies. Cannot the unemployed of minority groups help their own people through carefully planned realistic programs.

Let's not bog down or fail; failure is always bad, but failure after a promise that creates hope is cruel.

That completes my statement, and I hope that the members of this Commission have questions to ask me, because I do want to answer any questions you might have.

The CHAIRMAN: First of all, have you given us a copy of your full report?

Mr. SAMORA: Yes, sir, I have given a copy to the staff.

The CHAIRMAN: And you have included your proposals in that report, have you not, sir?

Mr. SAMORA: I have, sir, and I will appreciate very much if my proposals get to the right sources.

The reason for that is that this proposal has come about through two organizations—through two unselfish organizations—who have contributed much to all ethnic groups, not only the Mexican Americans. And I might add that the best program which has ever existed, I would say throughout the United States, which has been mentioned here tonight has been the Headstart program.

That has been the "baby" that has come up to start working on the poverty programs. I want to say that this program was originated by the LULAC organization, the League of United Latin American Citizens organization. They have worked on this program for 4 years, voluntary, without funds; and you can see that it was proven.

The Mexican-American organizations have come up with another proposal that I hope you will look into. I hope you will look at it in Washington, and it has been accepted in many States—I should say the five Southwestern States—and because of minority groups that do exist in the five Southwestern States, that does not mean that it has not been accepted nationally.

I have letters to prove that from Kansas City, Mo.; and where people exist that need attention and help, I have letters to prove that they also have accepted and want to become a part of this SER organization, it is called "jobs for progress," Operation SER.

Many reasons have come about for the creation of this organization.

To my estimation—and I will say that I have volunteered and so have the board, and so has community action, and so has the State Department, so has the Migrant Ministry, and so has every existing agency of the Government contributed and donated voluntarily of their time, not only in the daytime, but such as yours at night and Saturdays and Sundays.

We just ran a survey to put into the Operation SER. This was voluntary because we have not been funded, and we call it the skilled operation program, and it has already been successful.

We had over 200 people involved in 2 weeks helping and cooperating to make this proposal a success.

Now I want to add something here to the problems that I have heard.

We talk about training programs. I have heard of a program, just a little while ago. This man was training to be a welder. He had no job; so what happened? We get funded to get that individual or individuals into another program because after he was trained, there was no job, no industries.

Mr. HENDERSON: Let me interrupt you a minute.

Do you mean that there was no job within the immediate vicinity where he wanted to live; or, if there was a job there was some reason why he could not get one as a welder?

Mr. SAMORA: For instance, Dr. Henderson—well, let's take Maricopa County where I live and with which I was involved in an MDTA program. Now this has been 3 years ago. I know these people personally. They had been trained and had been certified, all carrying in their pockets a card saying "Certified Welder."

But had we such an organization, we could have looked into the future of these dead-end programs; we would have found them to be completely without a future. But there is no such organization.

Mr. HENDERSON: What I am getting at, is that you raised the question earlier of racial discrimination, and I was wondering if you were alluding to this point; that is, that a person trained as a welder, because of his Mexican-American descent, he could not get a job?

This, if true, presents a problem of racial discrimination when it comes to actual employment.

Mr. SAMORA: I am not only referring to the Mexican American, Dr. Henderson, I am referring to all existing training programs where skilled self-operation under the SER proposal is going to help them by not only creating employment, but through Government contracts where these people can be motivated into industry; and, if we follow statistics, we know that in 1968 or 1969—

Going back—well, let's talk about the Mexican Americans. We have many thousands of Mexican Americans in the area; 75 percent of these people are employed on farms, and only 25 percent are employed in other jobs, and these are low skill jobs. You know what I mean.

Statistics show that by 1970, 75 percent will have to depend on industry for other more skilled jobs, and 25 percent in farm labor.

What I am trying to say is that we try to feed these people with training programs, and we don't realize that these people take advantage of these programs because of the subsistence that we are providing them with.

But we do not realize that at the end of the training program, it is a dead-end program. Do we have jobs for these people? I say that we should take on programs that exist or where we can continue to follow up with these people and not let them down. We cannot let them deteriorate.

Mr. HENDERSON: You cannot get any disagreement out of me on that. I agree with you wholeheartedly.

I was merely trying to find out, though, if it was the nature of the Phoenix economy that there are just no jobs available for welders; or whether it was a question of jobs being out there, but these people not being acceptable on these jobs because of their qualifications?

Mr. SAMORA: I would say there are not enough jobs for welders in our community, and I feel that we, as this organization is doing, we are looking into industry. In other words, they are doing it by preparing people.

Let's take, for instance, Western Electric. They work with their own personal funds, and they do have training programs.

In Phoenix, Ariz., they have a new plant coming up. They started training people 6 months ago at their own expense, through our organization, through the Urban League, and through other programs and other existing organizations, to give them something to work with.

Now, they are preparing these people to work instead of moving people from other States to create more poverty in our own area.

So I feel that there is some investigation to be done.

Mr. HENDERSON: Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN: When you mentioned about your proposal, of course you did mention that the project SER has already been in operation here in the five Southwestern States.

Is there another aspect, another project, that you are recommending; or are you recommending that this be continued; or are you recommending that it be extended; or just what is it more or less that you are recommending?

Mr. SAMORA: I would like to see the whole proposal be accepted.

This operation is only one segment, one part of the whole program that we are doing voluntarily and working with right now.

This is through the five Southwestern States, and why we feel that we should continue this work is because we see so many people voluntarily coming in to help us; so we feel that it is a good program. But in our proposal, we have these statistics of our States, of the needs, and why the need is here.

In other words, why should we train a welder; why should we train a TV mechanic; or why should we train a man in electronics; why should we get more clericals and typists; why should we have more training programs for nurses? This is because we see that we have many hospitals, for example, coming up. In other words, we have a reason, we show reasons with statistics and we show information that we have gathered from very valuable sources.

Mr. HENDERSON: I will tell you why I am so interested. I have another hat that I wear as a member of the National Manpower Committee, and we are very much concerned about the question of training for better jobs, of prevailing opportunities. I was struck when you made this point and that is why I am pursuing it.

Mr. SAMORA: I am real happy to hear that you are with Manpower.

Mr. HENDERSON: Well, it really does not mean anything here.

Mr. SAMORA: Well, it does to me, because if this program goes through—it has been accepted to a certain extent—but it is 50 percent financed by Manpower, which I am sure you are aware of; and 50 percent financed by OEO.

Mr. HENDERSON: Did I understand you to say that the Urban League was working with this skilled operation program?

Mr. SAMORA: Well, what I was trying to do is just draw you a picture, that we are lending our efforts and ourselves, and we are doing this with all other existing organizations.

We are extending ourselves to the extent that we have letters of cooperation. I think that is what we need, a little more cooperation between the existing agencies and programs.

Mr. HENDERSON: Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN: We get the impression, of course, that you have given a lot of thought and that you have done a lot of research in compiling this presentation for the Commission, and I know that this information will be useful to us.

I keep in mind that the interest that we have in the different problems that we have been exposed to here at these hearings, in view of all these problems we have heard about today, we will use ourselves as a means of conveying this information and place it in the proper hands for the proper action.

You, of course, must realize that there are limitations to what we can do. We can recommend; and you know the usual situation.

I think that the project as you have explained it here to us is one that is unique, that it has proven itself; and we will try to see that the proper analysis is made and we will try to be certain that we make the proper recommendations along those lines.

Mr. SAMORA: Could I say that, at this time, Chairman Laurel, I want to thank you, because in this audience here behind me, I would say there are at least 15 individuals who have been involved with the skilled operation program, and they have helped us get this program together, and especially the gentleman on this side, Mr. Steve Socia, who has been working with me for 6 months; and a lady down there, Mrs. Espanoza, who is also on the board; and there are many others that are here, and I want to thank them also at this time. Thank you so much for allowing me to make this presentation.

The CHAIRMAN: To the three of you, and to the many others who are helping you, we are very happy for you. Congratulations.

Now, the Commission will recognize Raul Rodriquez, State supervisor, Work Experience and Training Programs, for the State of New Mexico Department of Public Welfare, Santa Fe, N. Mex., and he is representing the American GI Forum, and he will talk about the problems of Mexican Americans.

Now we are very much interested in whatever problems or ideas you might have in connection with what you want to tell us here, and if you are able to summarize your report to some extent, we certainly would appreciate it, because it is getting very late.

Mr. RODRIQUEZ: Mr. Chairman, I have a phobia for microphones and loudspeakers; therefore, if I can just put it aside here, I would like to just talk directly to the Commission.

The CHAIRMAN: That will be perfectly all right, sir.

STATEMENT OF FACUNDO RAUL RODRIQUEZ

Mr. RODRIQUEZ: I am Facundo Raul Rodriquez, and the subject of my presentation will be "Meeting the Needs of the Reduced Fellowman in Combating Rural Poverty."

Mr Chairman, honorable members of this Commission, if we just recall back 30 years in our country's history—we find that not since the great depression of the 1930's has so much been done about rural poverty as is being intended to be done today. We all are aware that a large subgroup of our society lives in the pockets of poverty in rural areas. They exist without the kind of educational experience that enable our people to become self-supporting citizens—the majority of them being in the taxpayers category.

We also know that the kind of behavior that leads to poverty is learned, and that while learning this behavior these individuals have failed to learn those things that make them succeed in a wholesome American way of life.

We cannot afford to have the social pathology—the juvenile delinquency, adult crime, family disorganization, physical and mental disease—that goes with unemployment, illiteracy, and slum living. Neither can we afford in terms of our social pride to be part of an affluent society that has such an unpleasant side to it.

I'll very briefly try to describe who our "reduced fellowmen" are: They are groups with the following characteristics:

(1) They are at the bottom of the American society in terms of income.

(2) They have a rural background.

(3) They suffer from social and economic discrimination at the hands of the majority of the society.

(4) They are distributed all over the United States, but are concentrated in Southern, Southwestern, and Western States.

(5) In racial and ethnic terms, these groups must definitely include Mexican Americans with a rural background who have migrated into the West and Middle West and, for sure, the ones in our Southwestern States.

What Can We Do About It?

There are many answers, but part of the answer lies in a number of myths that all of us have shared about our economy, our society, and ourselves.

The first is the explicit faith that so many of us have held that our economic system will overcome, in the long run, most of the obstacles facing our society. By developing our economy fully, and using the resources of the Government wisely, we believed that unemployment would fall, incomes would rise, and poverty thereby would automatically be reduced. While there is evidence that economic development has much to do with helping some of the poor, increased opportunities do not help those who are unable to take advantage of them. There are some obstacles which our economic system alone will not overcome.

Secondly, the myth that if a person has the energy and the will to work, he will be able to make his way. In a sense, this means that poverty and unemployment are a result of choice, not a condition of society; a manifestation of laziness, not economic isolation. The cataclysmic depression of the 1930's jolted this belief when millions of Americans were left jobless through no fault of their own, and were also powerless to help themselves. The economy had let them down and so had the American way of life.

Thirdly, which in reality has held back action against poverty, is the "status quo" myth—that things are basically fine, that we have the tools to conquer the problems we face, and really only need to change or adjust some minor mechanisms of government to reach those few people who need help. Government must be flexible, alert to change, coordinated, and personal. The old textbook three-layered system of government with State, local, and Federal Governments clearly assigned their tasks has already given way to a compartmentalized approach based on government responsibilities. Communication up and down the line is much better—a county welfare director talks easily and often to his superiors at the State and Federal level but rarely to the county health department agent. Today, problems span the responsibilities of government and yet administrators and the departments see these problems in their own terms. The poverty problem is seen as a problem of welfare by welfare departments, as a problem of education by educational departments, as a problem of health by the health departments, as a problem of employment by the employment security commissions, and so on. While elected officials like the Governors are held responsible for carrying out these programs, in fact they have little or no control over these segmented activities.

What is needed is a multipronged, coordinated attack rather than an attack by parts of government on parts of problems. Michael Harrington, America's analyst of the poverty program, has said in "The Other America":

> In case after case, it has been documented that one cannot deal with the various components of poverty in isolation. Changing this or that condition, but leaving the basic structure intact. Consequently, a campaign against the misery of the poor should be comprehensive. It should think not in terms of this or that aspect of poverty but along the lines of establishing new communities, or substituting a human environment for the inhuman that now exists.

Lastly, the myth—that the ready tendency of American belief—that money will solve all our problems. Too often the initial governmental action has been a reflex to a symptom rather than anticipating it. Examples abound in our history, but none seems as potent as the fact that there are still one-fifth of our citizens living in poverty despite all the programs and economic development we have achieved in the last three decades.

Future Policy and Action

Admitting that rural poverty comprises the disenfranchised, the poor, the badly educated, and many times those excluded from the national dialog, we come to the recognition of and the admittance of these conditions by the "reduced-fellowman" himself; and this makes possible our tackling this vital problem realistically.

In this part of the United States the problem is further complicated by the diverse population. It is very difficult to picture an average Negro American or an average Italian American. By the same token it is as ridiculous to postulate a typical Mexican American. On the other hand, nearly 1 million live in Texas at an economic level not much higher than their ancestor after the fall of the Alamo; most of these are in south Texas in 30 counties along the lower gulf coast and the Rio Grande Valley. These people are largely rural, nearly illiterate, and live a similar life to the plantation systems of the South. Further north and east, the "Spanish" of New Mexico and Colorado claim to be very different. Many claim unmixed ancestry from early Spanish settlers during the 17th century to escape the tag "Mexican" stigma; and some, sorry to say, adopt racial prejudices and discriminate against new arrivals from Mexico and sometimes against anyone with a dark complexion. While Mexican Americans in California appear to be more militant in their demands, they are less specific about their objectives. Texans are the opposite—more specific in their demands, but less militant in the way they go about it.

Gentlemen, I give you this merely as a background that our people, that are largely confined to one region of the United States, are hard to see and much harder to understand. We are very individualistic by nature, and I seriously doubt that we could ever be united in toto as other ethnic groups are able to unite.

However, it is mandatory that our Federal Government emphasizes this bicultural and bilingual difference in all our programs and create motivation on the part of our people to become self-supporting or partial self-supporting members of our society. Our people lack motivation and at the same time carry a distrust for our programs many times because the programs are not understood or the administrator of the program is foreign or unknown to them.

A bicultural and bilingual atmosphere must be created so that the receiver of the programs can feel comfortable while participating in it.

The administrator of any program involving the "rural reduced fellowman" should be himself bicultural and bilingual to be able to fully understand and feel the same way the participants of the programs do. To know the language is not enough; it helps but is not sufficient. In addition, an administrator must be 100 percent committed to the cause. He must manifest a genuine dedication of doing all that is humanly possible to eradicate this curse from our people.

More of our people should be administering and also employed as teachers in these programs. Take some of our migrant programs, for example. The administrators know the language they talk but, in reality, lack the understanding, the insight of our people and, in turn, create a mistrust which is very hard to overcome once it becomes evident. For the immediate future, our Government should concentrate and give priority to a crash program of say from 5 to 10 years on work experience and training and include adult basic education for our people, at the same time keeping our children in school, in good health, in good housing, in decent neighborhoods, and in a society free of discrimination and, as a result assure a future generation of not becoming recipients of public assistance tomorrow.

We should encourage the building into our public assistance program with Federal funds (Federal financial participation be provided in the costs of materials, supervision, training, and other associated costs) resources that will assure training, retraining, and placement of all employable recipients or potential recipients.

Title V of the Economic Opportunity Act, or some similar program that would be administered by State departments of public welfare, should be continued. It was through this vehicle that for the first time State welfare departments were able to conduct work experience and training programs for the extremely impoverished or underprivileged. Previous to the enactment and implementation of this program the vocational rehabilitation programs throughout the nation were extremely limited. They were limited both from the financing angle and from limited personnel.

As a consequence, people of this nation who had never known work experience or opportunity, and as a result knew no other way of life than welfare assistance, were never afforded the opportunity of any training. Outstanding cases have developed throughout the nation and especially in our State of New Mexico whereby we have taken people with seemingly absolutely no potential or qualifications and trained them to the extent that for the first time in their life they assumed the role of wage earner. It is very understandable that with the limited funds and personnel available through ordinary rehabilitation channels the ones with the most potential are the ones who were chosen to be trained or rehabilitated. With a program similar to Title V, I feel that people could be reached for training that would otherwise have no opportunity.

Though I don't particularly like the term "residual," it is probably how you would refer to the people who would be reached only through DPW training.

Furthermore, the inclusion of youth 18 to 22 where the State's AFDC programs do not include this age group should be provided. If such a long-range program can be realized, it will give some security to the administrators so that long-range planning is feasible. Also, the establishment of inservice training for the administrators whereby this rural poverty war can be planned, discussed, and carried out in a well-organized manner with provisions for review and evaluation and an exchange of ideas by all people concerned. Dr. George Sanchez put it all in Spanish: "No queremos que nos den atole con el dedo." (We don't want to be fed mush with a finger.)

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Rodriquez.

Now, questions from the members of the Commission. Mr. Gibson?

Mr. GIBSON: Mr. Rodriquez, can you give us some idea of the number of persons who have belonged to your program in New Mexico; No. 1, the number of persons who have been enrolled in the program; No. 2, the number of persons who have completed the training; and, No. 3, the number of persons who now hold jobs as a result of this experience?

Mr. RODRIQUEZ: I am very happy you asked that question. By coincidence, I happen to have the figures.

It is the last stage of the report that I gave my Commissioner before I left, and it says that in an 18-month report of work training programs, July 1, 1965 through December of 1966, over 2,200 have been involved, with 961 presently in work experience or training; 1,224 graduated; over 400 have been placed in employment; and over 100 are in higher training.

Mr. GIBSON: Thank you.

Mr. HENDERSON: What happened to the other 724?

Mr. RODRIQUEZ: We hope that they are still waiting. They are being extended social services, and we are supposed to carry them for 6 months, hoping that maybe half of those will become employed.

Mr. HENDERSON: Do you have any explanation as to why they were not able to be placed like the others?

Mr. RODRIQUEZ: I could give you a lot of reasons, Dr. Henderson, but it would take all night; but one general reason is that adult basic education is lacking. They just do not have the basic education.

Mr. HENDERSON: How did they graduate?

Mr. RODRIQUEZ: Well, they graduated from janitor training, custodial services training, domestic-type training.

Mr. HENDERSON: Could this be a flaw in your approach, not to confine your training to civic occupational training?

Mr. RODRIQUEZ: I hate to criticize any department, but, you see, we lack adult basic education and really that is not the responsibility of Title V.

Mr. **Henderson**: Well, this is not new, as we know from experience, at least 4 years of experience.

The first year of MDTA, one of the early experiences that led to an amendment of the act was not in the best interests of the program to train them for an occupation without giving them any additional training; so, this was amended.

Now, in a work experience program, you cannot take these 2,000 people that are involved—if you ignore it, well, you cannot ignore it in the best sense of the word—but apparently this was not included.

I just wonder if you are aware of these other experiences?

Mr. **Rodriquez**: It was included, but the training time is not long enough. We have adult basic education, we have adult education with this program, and we said that from zero to first grade, from first grade to fourth grade, from fifth grade to eighth grade, we use a program of 160 clock hours, the amount of time suggested by various book and curriculum companies whereby that in 160 clock hours an individual would cover four grades of education.

We also have a high school equivalency course.

Mr. **Henderson**: Mind you, I am not questioning your program; I am merely trying to get at something here that would aid me in a policy recommendation.

Mr. **Rodriquez**: That is why I am here, sir.

Mr. **Henderson**: Where you have a work experience program of welfare recipients, and go in among some of these rural people, it would seem that we might have our hands on something here that may be worth inquiring further into for depth and policy recommendations.

Mr. **Rodriquez**: By all means. That is why, Dr. Henderson, I included that in my recommendations—to be sure and include adult basic education.

Mr. **Henderson**: All right, thank you.

The **Chairman**: Mr. Gibson, do you have another question?

Mr. **Gibson**: Yes, I do, I have a couple more questions. You have 400 people now employed of those who graduated. Is that correct?

Mr. **Rodriquez**: Yes, sir.

Mr. **Gibson**: Do you have any idea of what the hourly earnings would be, on an average, for those persons who are working?

Mr. **Rodriquez**: The minimum wage, I would imagine; well, in any event, it would be about $1 an hour average right now. There are other individuals who have gone through our program, and one in particular that I know of, who is making $3.50 an hour.

Mr. **Gibson**: But the average you think would be about $1 an hour?

Mr. **Rodriquez**: That is right.

Mr. **Gibson**: We are speaking of heads of household, are we not?

Mr. **Rodriquez**: That is right.

Mr. **Gibson**: And, therefore, they are supporting families, and generally they are the sole source of support for these families?

Mr. **Rodriquez**: Yes.

Mr. **Gibson**: What would you say the average size of these families would be?

Mr. **Rodriquez**: The average size of the family is five.

Mr. Gibson: The average size of the family is five, so that $40 a week for 52 weeks—they would come out considerably less than $3,000 a year for the five people. Is that correct?

Mr. Rodriquez: Yes.

Mr. Gibson: I point these things out because to me they raise the basic question as to how effective this approach can be when it cannot meet some of the problems which surround the qualifications of the people.

Granted, you give them certain qualifications which they did not previously have; but I would wonder whether at $1 an hour for five persons they would not be better off on public assistance.

Mr. Rodriquez: They are being supplemented by public assistance, you see.

Mr. Gibson: After they have actually completed the program?

Mr. Rodriquez: Yes, if their needs have not been met and they are still qualified and eligible for public assistance programs, they are supplemented by aid.

Mr. Gibson: Thank you.

Mr. Gallegos: You advocate a strong coordination of the various services that may be able to help people to break out of poverty.

What is your opinion regarding the possibility that the OEO program money be spun off and given to the Department of Labor for implementation.

Do you feel that this would strengthen efforts to fight poverty?

Mr. Rodriquez: Well, that is history already, Mr. Gallegos, and the way I feel personally is that it will cost more. The Labor Department cannot extend social services to our people who need it. They never have reached the real core, the hard core of our people.

Mr. Gallegos: What do you mean they have not reached the hard core?

Mr. Rodriquez: They haven't reached it through MDTA. They always took the cinches, the potential ones who could be placed. Today, we need to reach the reduced fellowmen.

Mr. Gallegos: Thank you.

Mr. Gibson: I am interested in a comment you made. You were very candid with us by pointing out in your presentation that you indeed had followed somewhat the same line since that those persons who were now involved in your program, from among the possible choices, were the best, or the banner persons who had the greatest promise and potential.

Do you recall approximately how many people applied to your program? You say that in your program you had 2,200 involved. How many people did apply?

Mr. Rodriquez: Well, our caseload to date in New Mexico is 47,000; but we do not have the Statewide program. We had at one time 20 counties, and we have 32 counties in all, and we are phasing out half of those and we hope to have about 9 counties for next year.

Mr. Gibson: What would you say would be the percentage figure, what percentage figure does this 2,200 represent of the total need population?

Mr. Rodriquez: This figure was mostly from the aid to families of dependent children, mostly women. I would say roughly one-third.

Mr. **Gibson**: And you washed out a certain number, and you washed out those with the least potential; is that correct?

Mr. **Rodriquez**: Yes.

Mr. **Gibson**: So that even your program in that sense is still lacking.

Mr. **Rodriquez**: I would have to assent on that, sir.

Mr. **Gibson**: Thank you.

Mr. **Gallegos**: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask another question here.

The **Chairman**: Go ahead.

Mr. **Gallegos**: You said that the OEO programs have not reached down far enough; or, have they just not reached enough people? I would like your comments on that.

Mr. **Rodriquez**: The OEO programs?

Mr. **Gallegos**: The Department of Labor programs, yes.

Mr. **Rodriquez**: Well, we haven't tried it yet under this new legislation.

Come July 1 of this year, the training aspect of the work experience will be purchased from the Labor Department.

The Department of Public Welfare will still be responsible for the referral, the pretraining, and the extension of social services.

Mr. **Gallegos**: But are you saying that from your previous experience, the Department of Labor programs have not reached the people?

Mr. **Rodriquez**: Correct; through the MDTA, they have not reached the people.

Mr. **Gallegos**: The Department, if they are given more responsibility, you do not feel they will be any more effective than they have been in the past? Is that your opinion?

Mr. **Rodriquez**: No, I don't believe they will; so that is right.

Mr. **Gallegos**: Thank you.

The **Chairman**: You have a question Dr. Henderson?

Mr. **Henderson**: I would like to get an opinion from you.

On this question of MDTA, I will not pursue that with you. That is an aspect, however, to my mind.

But I will ask you another question and maybe you can give me your opinion on it.

All day today as we have talked about the progress problems of the rural poor, only once—I believe only once—was there any reference here to the basic problem, that is the basic characteristic of the poor, that being the lack of money.

But I think I have heard this from only one person today.

Secondly, I am interested in the fact that I have heard no reference as to what has been in vogue in recent months with regard to a guaranteed annual income, from an economic concept, guaranteed types of income maintenance.

Now, I would like to know from you, as a person in the welfare field and as a person who is interested in work experience, the aspects of welfare, and also you presumably have the objective of getting people to a self-supporting status—I presume that is the objective—now, what is your reaction to proposals which run along these lines: that is, to allow welfare recipients, for example, to earn money while they receive welfare, that is one example; or what is your reaction to the idea of just outright grants in the form, let us say, of $3,000 a year as a minimum, or maybe even $4,000 a year, to welfare recipients, and further that this be based on need.

Do you follow me? I am just trying to get your reaction to this sort of a possibility. You are the first welfare worker, I believe, in this sense that we have had before us today.

Mr. RODRIQUEZ: Dr. Henderson, let me preface my remarks by saying that I purposely evaded this area because the minimum of $3,000 is not a factor in establishing eligibility in our own programs in New Mexico.

I am in favor of extending stipends provided that they are on an 8-hour day and have the initiative and commitment to get something out of it and not just be provided a stipend.

Mr. HENDERSON: You are against a dole, in other words?

Mr. RODRIQUEZ: I am against a dole, yes.

Mr. HENDERSON: You feel that a person ought to be actively involved in some kind of gainful activity, whether it be education or work or in some other respect in order to qualify for that?

Mr. RODRIQUEZ: That is my own personal opinion, yes, sir.

Mr. HENDERSON: All right, we have your opinion then.

The CHAIRMAN: We have time for just one more question. I will recognize Mr. Gibson.

Mr. GIBSON: Mr. Rodriquez, I believe that we have all noted today, when hearing testimony from the various persons who are involved in various conditions of poverty, a very impressive indication of the need for community action programs, of the OEO programs under the Title II, around the impact this has had on their expectations and hopes.

The one very important facet of it is, of course, participation of those involved at various levels, planning and participation, and so forth.

It is traditionally true that the welfare department services persons—plans for them rather than with them. I think that is not an unfair characterization.

I would like to have your reaction to the Title V orientation which is unlike Title II orientation, and it does not necessarily include participation of those involved in the program and the planning and setting up of objectives, and so forth.

I wonder, No. 1, what your reaction is to this as a valid approach; and, No. 2, if you believe that it is valid, how much resistance do you think there will be within the departments of welfare in our nation to having this element injected into programs like this one, and other similar programs?

Mr. RODRIQUEZ: I wish to think—and many times, this might not have been the case—but, that we try to have the caseworkers work with the recipients in asking them what they want as programs.

In turn, we would work with the welfare directors and the case supervisor and caseworker in formulating our programs to meet the needs of the recipients.

You made a comment about CAP programs doing this.

But, if there is nothing else that the CAP organization has done, it has focused and brought to light many services that were existing but that were not made known to the people who should have gotten them, or to the extent that the Community Action Organizations had extended a catalyst service to the community that is worthwhile.

Mr. GIBSON: I would zero in on that particular aspect of the CAP's contributional nature which puts a certain number of those served on the policy level, on the boards, for instance, which is different from the kind of counseling that a caseworker might do with a client in reaching some conclusions about his need—the fact that I can see, and I am sure you can, that there at times might be differences of opinion between a caseworker and a client in that the most prescribed solution would be the caseworker's rather than that of the client.

Mr. RODRIQUEZ: Yes, I agree, this problem partially lies because of the legislation itself, meaning that Title V bestowed on HEW and then on to the departments of public welfare who administered it, while Title II is a community action program and it is the basis for it being set in that fashion.

Mr. GIBSON: Now let me ask you this, and this will be my last one, and I will try to phrase it succinctly.

Would the department of welfare programs be improved if, legislatively, it were required that the served population participate in some significant measure in the policy?

Mr. RODRIQUEZ: I don't know.

Mr. GIBSON: Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Rodriquez, sir.

Mr. RODRIQUEZ: Let me just add one thing. Someone asked who was I, and I have a dossier which I have provided to the Commission; but I was born in Santa Fe, N. Mex., some four score and two years ago, come next month.

I have a family, a boy and a girl, and my education has been all the way to within 20 hours of a doctor's degree, and I happen to have been fortunate to serve in the U.S. Army Air Force, when it was called an Air Force, and I received all those decorations, including a Presidential Citation.

Incidentally, a brief sketch of my life is in "Who's Who," amongst them: Who's Who in New Mexico; Who's Who in the West; Who's Who in Education; and Who's Who International; and that is it.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Rodriquez. It has been a pleasure.

Mr. RODRIQUEZ: Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: The Commission will now recognize Dr. Willard Abraham. Is he present in the room? (No response.)

All right, we will then move on to Lee Lukson, director of the Yakima Valley Council for Community Action, Inc., from Yakima, Wash.

Mr. LUKSON: Before I begin my testimony, I might say that I admire the stamina of the Commission. It has been more than 12 hours that you have been sitting up there and almost all of you are still up there; and I think you are to be commended certainly for being true front line warriors on the poverty front.

I asked that Mr. Stephens give all of you a copy of my remarks so that I might not have to read them all, since I know that it is getting late and I know that this session must end sometime. It is much too late to make a formal delivery of my statement.

The CHAIRMAN: All right, Mr. Lukson, you may proceed to make your statement.

Mr. LUKSON: All right, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

STATEMENT OF LEE E. LUKSON

Mr. LUKSON: I will speak on "Rural Social Planning and the Role of the Community Action Agency."

How can we do a better job in our war against poverty?

To date, being inexperienced soldiers, we have not realized the strength of the enemy, and we've not used our weapons properly.

We have attacked separate areas of poverty as though they could be eliminated separately. We have attacked bad housing, poor health, and joblessness. And we have said: "This is poverty." But these are the results of poverty, not the causes.

Better housing, health, and jobs are absolutely necessary, but they do not eliminate the causes of want.

One cause is the lack of job skills. But we teach skills in the cities only to find that a steady flow of unskilled people are coming in from the country, combining this and the related problems. And urban training programs may attract more unskilled workers to the city, compounding the perplexity further.

We are emptying our countrysides and glutting our cities.

Why not more skill training in smaller cities to stem this flow? And why not, then, try to decentralize some of our industry to the smaller cities? It would improve the economy of our rural areas and alleviate the poverty and growth problems of the cities —less sight, sound, air, and water pollution, less traffic, less crowding of people.

So, we can combat poverty in both urban and rural areas by locating new industry in rural areas and providing extensive skill training there for unskilled workers who might otherwise flee to the city.

Our best weapon is large-scale social planning. And we can do it easier in rural than urban areas because of less population and less distinction between social classes and ethnic groups. Too, our cities have extensive and deeply entrenched, and often inadequate, ways of dealing with poverty. The complex of outdated welfare services is a formidable obstacle to planning. A major obstacle is the mental attitude of low income people themselves, with their feeling of rootlessness in the large, complex city.

Rural communities have fewer people to plan for, and the different social classes and ethnic groups more often intermingle, hence are more tolerant of each other. Thus the "haves" in a rural community more readily join to help the "have nots." The community is easier to mobilize, especially if its economic fate is at stake. Finally, rural low income people perhaps are more optimistic because of their simpler life and surroundings.

With social planning we can join two kinds of social change— the revolutionary, where the disadvantaged are slowly learning that by organizing they may gain economic and political strength; and the evolutionary, where the "haves" help the "have nots" gain some small but not very threatening gains.

So far, neither approach has caused significant social change. The revolutionaries have woefully underestimated the monolithic character of the affluent establishment, while the evolutionaries, being part of it, are protective and restrictive in their approach. These forces need common ground to plan change.

The local Community Action Agencies, created under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, can be this common ground, especially in rural areas where the problems of coming together are less formidable.

Thus, if a fundamental cause of urban poverty—the lack of skills in rural workers attracted to the city by industry—and if a fundamental cause of rural poverty—the lack of industry—can both be attacked, rural communities with rural Community Action Agencies seem to offer the best tool for the kind of planning necessary.

An example of this is the Yakima Valley in Washington State, which economists call a "low growing" region. Industry and agriculture are expanding slowly. It is primarily an agricultural area, once had a great agricultural growth, and might again with further development of its water resources. It attracts large numbers of seasonal farmworkers. Some 7,000 a year move in with the crops, but twice that many have settled permanently in the small towns of the valley. The valley is the northern terminus of the west coast migrant stream, which originates in south Texas.

Today many of these people are moving on to Seattle, 120 miles northwest of Yakima. In the Puget Sound area surrounding Seattle, there are now 1.9 million people. By the year 2000, this will have increased to 4 million. Seattle is booming because of rapid growth of the Boeing Airplane Company and other industries. They are like magnets, drawing unskilled workers who are unable to find steady work in the rural areas. Unfortunately, in Seattle they too often merely swell the ranks of the unemployed, despite the fact that Boeing recently lowered its educational requirements from a high school graduate to a 10th grade equivalency.

The Yakima Valley's Community Action Agency is bringing together representatives of the "haves" and "have nots" for social planning. Its board of directors, called the Yakima Valley Council for Community Action, contains leaders from both the affluent and the disadvantaged groups.

Planning is usually done by the staff but is approved or disapproved by the board. The staff also contains representatives of both groups, but the low income people are in the majority.

The CAA has developed a large-scale plan to train the valley's 15,000 unskilled workers in gradually increasing numbers. It is called the comprehensive manpower program (CMP), one of the few like it in the rural areas of the nation.

The CMP is run in cooperation with the State Department of Employment Security, which has specific responsibility under a recent directive by the Department of Labor. Its aim is threefold: No. 1, the outreach, to locate the unskilled person and interest him in preparing for a job; determine his capabilities and needs. No. 2, the education and skill training. No. 3, the placement and follow-up, to help him adjust successfully.

The CAA has developed the basic structure for an outreach program in four key areas of the valley where there are concentrations of unskilled farmworkers: Southeast Yakima, Wapato, Toppenish, and Sunnyside. Community action centers in each of these communities are now using community aids to study the specific needs of the target population. When CMP begins, these centers will begin the outreach activity. In addition, Operation Grassroots, designed to organize the poor for improving their environment, especially housing, is being expanded to include outreach.

To help fill the lack of education programs for adults, the CAA has joined with the State Department of Employment Security and other agencies to coordinate the present training programs in the valley.

A program has also been developed with the aid of the State OEO office—in its role as technical assistant. It will include classes to give the unskilled the equivalent of a high school education. It will also involve the training of teachers, counselors, and aids, as specialists in adult education.

In skill training, the CAA has joined with the Department of Employment Security in forming a coordinating committee. This brings together all agencies to create a single training program for the unskilled. These include Yakima Valley College, the State Department of Public Assistance, the State Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Yakima County Agricultural Extension Service, and others. All of the work of restoring human lives, both educational and vocational, will be coordinated by the CAA and the State Department of Employment Security at one location, called the job clinic. This will be the place where the unskilled farm labor can get counseling and guidance toward rehabilitation.

Concerning placement, the CAA is promoting two key activities: First, job search is being handled by the new on-the-job training office. A Federal Department of Labor grant has made it possible for the YVCAA to undertake to find and fill 110 job openings in the area. The Department of Employment Security is cooperating here, too, in its usual role of placing the jobless. Second is job creation. The CAA is cooperating in the forming of a local development corporation. With aid under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1965 and from the Small Business Administration, the corporation will try to bring business and industry into the valley. We hope it will be able to offer "custom trained" employees who are trained in the comprehensive manpower program.

Trainees often have medical, legal, housing, food, and other problems that must be attended to before they can even begin their training. The CAA will coordinate these services in its job clinic. Where none are available in the community, it will create them. Day care services for children and stipends for the family will also be needed. The CAA will have the use of a number of mobile day care centers, and it has requested stipends in its project proposals.

Training programs like the one described can be achieved with two outside forces: funds and expertise. Representatives of the entire rural community have been involved and the entire community stands to benefit. The program will speed the development of the area as an industrial center by importing industry and by retaining the untapped work force.

The CAA has discovered that the prospects for large-scale social planning at the local level are excellent—again given money and expertise. Neither are in short supply nationally, but they are often unavailable in the rural areas. A rural Community Action Agency may know what it needs in social planning and how to create and implement plans. But, unlike urban organizations, it is often hard put to locate the exact sources of funds and obtain them. And plans are useless without funds. Further, the rural CAA often has difficulty obtaining advice on professional activities like evaluation and training. It needs the knowledge and experience of professionals such as professors, counselors, psychologists, efficiency engineers, and so forth. The rural CAA often has a sudden need for teams of such experts. If they were available, there would likely be a much wiser use of funds.

With funds and expertise readily available, a rural CAA like the one in the Yakima Valley could do much more in alleviating poverty in both rural and urban areas. It could easily enlarge the CMP so that the flow of unskilled workers to the city may be stopped—given, again, the importation of new industry.

With the aid of the Labor Mobility Act, the flow of workers may actually be reversed from the cities back to the rural areas. The Yakima Valley, for instance, could become a "high growing" region.

A rural CAA could prevent the conditions of poverty, such as overpopulation, which might accompany the buildup of an industrial work force, because of its concern with the total environment of the trainee. It would be unrealistic to try to eliminate or control, say, bad housing on an individual basis only. The CAA's concern with avoiding bad housing for trainees would eventually lead it to explore low cost self-help housing and to plan for constructing such housing on a large scale with the help of low interest Government loans. In the same way, the CAA would necessarily begin planning such things as dental and medical clinics, cooperative stores, legal aid bureaus, credit unions, and so forth. It would be planning for the entire community, since it would not be feasible or desirable to restrict it to the poor. But the aim would be "maximum feasible participation of the poor" in operating the various activities mentioned above.

It also seems likely that if the rural CAA successfully manages the operation of a large-scale training program and its supportive services—with the help of other agencies and institutions—it will eventually plan activities not directly related to the rehabilitation of human beings. It could become the natural agent for planned change in other areas of community life, like recreation programs and adult educational programs in the schools. It could become involved in economic development in ways that might not immediately benefit low income people. Planning business research and investment activities are examples, perhaps, in the expansion of agriculture. The Yakima Valley, for example, has great potential for agricultural growth if its water resources could be further developed; also for the growth of related industries such as canning and packing. With its great freedom to be creative, the rural CAA is the natural agent for planned change in many areas of community life.

In closing, the War on Poverty has created much hope among low income people, though it has not always administered successfully to their needs. This hope is the greatest asset that social planning has. The rural Community Action Agency, more than any other kind of organization, is in a position to provide a constructive means of expression for this hope. Without this, and unless the planning itself is soon implemented, we may fear the worst. The frustration of hope will tip the balance in favor of revolution rather than evolution, and there will be an increase in violence in both our rural and urban areas. At the moment the balance favors the sort of community action advocated in this paper, but the rural CAA cannot maintain this state of affairs without help from above.

With this in mind, the following recommendations might be made to the Federal Government:

No. 1, to create at the Federal level a Department of Social Development. One of the obstacles to effective social planning at the local level is the increasing fragmentation of Federal programs which are individually intended to deal with specific social problems. The fact that poverty has deep-seated causes and that the poverty of one area is directly related to that of another necessitates a comprehensive kind of planning at all levels of Government. These Federal programs cannot be simply coordinated at the Federal level by various governmental departments, since the individual purpose and outlook of each department precludes actual coordination. What is needed is a single strong department which can examine a particular social problem in the context of its causes and other interrelated social problems, study the means of solving the problem within the units of the enabling legislation, and make funds and expertise readily available for action at the local level. Such a department should be created out of the separate departments now in existence, such as Health, Education, and Welfare; Labor; Housing and Urban Development; and OEO.

No. 2, to promote the integration of the public and private sectors of activity for the purposes of ambitious social planning. The causes of poverty lie within the control of three areas of American life—the Government, the universities, and big business. Of these three, the only one in a position to act for social planning is the Government. The Department of Social Development called for above must extensively involve the academic world and the business world in its operations. Subcontracting is not sufficient. Planning commissions must be created at the national regional levels in which representatives of all three areas work constantly together at such crucial remedial measures as the decentralization of industry.

No. 3, to define the relationship of local planning organizations such as Community Action Agencies to the Department of Social Development or, in the event that it never materializes, then to HEW, OEO, and so forth. Assuming that these local organizations are in actual contact with poverty and interrelated social problems and therefore best able to work at solutions to them, they must be able to choose from among a variety of means of achieving solutions. These means—including funds and expertise—must be made available to them by an outside agent, which must have the necessary authority to catalog a wide range of them from public and private sources. In other words, the old notion of "delegating responsibility" ought to be shelved in defining the new relationship of Federal and local planning organizations. It might be replaced by the notion of "local selectivity." Probably the best way to give substance to this suggestion is to create subregional offices —under existing Federal regions such as those of HEW—where the range of problem-solving means may be displayed within the immediate reach of a local group such as a CAA. This kind of "mail-order service" will be a prime factor in successful social planning at the local level.

No. 4, to increase the powers of local CAA's. These organizations are at this time the ones most meaningfully involved in the problems of poverty. However, they are often frustrated in their attempts to work out solutions, such as effective social planning. Their authority may be enhanced by the increased availability of funds and expertise, as suggested above, and by the backing of a new energetic Federal department such as a Department of Social Development. However, local CAA's ought be given official responsibility for social planning which involves the integration of functions of local municipal, county, State, and Federal agencies. In other words, the CAA has to be a local equivalent of the Federal Department of Social Development, which will enable it to make good use of the recommendations of the integrated commissions called for under the Department of Social Development.

No. 5, to promote administrative efficiency in government at the State, county, and municipal levels to the extent that social planning may be expedited. Large-scale social planning at the local level—such as a comprehensive manpower program—cannot succeed without cooperation at these different levels. State departments of employment security and of public assistance, county extension agents, community colleges, municipal planning commissions—all these functions and many others must be brought into working relationships. The Department of Social Development might undertake as one of its responsibilities coordination with such key functions at other levels of government. If social planning offers a means of combating poverty and other social problems to governments in general, then the Federal Government—which recognizes the value of such planning—might aid State, county, and municipal governments to assume further responsibilities in this area. In other words, the catalog of sources of funds and expertise—as well as funds and expertise themselves —must be made available to other levels of government, in addition to local planning organizations such as CAA's.

In summary, I would recommend that we reverse the flow of people from rural to urban areas and you can speed the war against poverty.

Today's mushroom growth of the nation's larger cities is compounding the problem of poverty and making it much more difficult to solve.

The rapid decline in farm jobs today is speeding the movement of the less skilled and less educated from rural communities to the cities.

If we could decentralize large industry into the rural areas, we could accomplish a number of things.

First, we would provide jobs in our smaller communities for the rural unemployed—and they wouldn't have to go to the cities.

Second, and of great importance, we could retrain unemployed workers under better circumstances, simply because it is easier to develop well-rounded education and training programs in a smaller community.

Third, of course, many people would be more content because they would prefer the smaller community they know rather than move to the strange and sometimes frightening city.

Fourth, with a slower, more stable growth, many of our cities' current problems would be much less difficult to cope with.

The report outlined the comprehensive manpower program that Yakima County now has underway.

The Community Action Agencies under the Economic Opportunity Act could be broadened to deal with many community-wide problems other than poverty.

The CAA's board of directors, being a cross-section of society, is the only body in most rural communities that has a community-wide perspective. They are lending unique new concepts to community-wide thinking, and they can offer much in the way of creative thinking on other community problems.

With that, I will stop and try to answer any questions the Commission may have.

The CHAIRMAN: All right, if any of the members of the Commission have any questions, they may ask them now.

I will recognize Mr. Gallegos.

Mr. GALLEGOS: Mr. Lukson, what is the trend in Washington with respect to the decrease of the small-type family farms to the large-type corporate farms, especially in light of the objective to increase the population in the northern part of the State; what are the prospects of helping to develop the economy of the small family farms? And then, secondly, do you feel that the road for regional planning, or for planning some of the long-range economic developments you speak of, might well come from OEO, which would mean that it might have a decrease in the amount of direct service it gives—may be giving the planning board some of the things that you are doing; or do you think that it should be given some public policy or at least implementation of this interest to do some of the social development planning which you speak about which might be done with another branch of the Federal Government?

Mr. LUKSON: In answer to your first question, there are very few small farms in the State of Washington. Most of them are large diversified farms and you find not the kind of situation that exists in the Ozarks, for example, in Missouri where we have a lot of feeder pig programs.

We have very large farms and there has never been too much of a question of, you know, small farms trying to maintain immunity. They have just gone out of existence.

In answer to your second question: Community Action Agencies —I think this is a national need. In most rural communities, this is the only social planning agency that those communities have; it is the only organization that represents a crosscut of that particular community.

But I think the Community Action Agencies need to be increased in their overall broad powers. I think somebody, at least some agency, has to assume this responsibility. It would seem to me that Community Action Agencies are well adapted to this.

No. 1, they have the basic involvement of people. As Dr. Davis mentioned much earlier today, you first have to be concerned about the people, and secondly, you have to be concerned about the system; and I think the Community Action Agencies are beginning to be oriented in this direction.

So we need a system of some kind, but we need to develop the system in response to the kinds of needs that would exist in a community relative to the people; and I think Community Action Agencies offer this kind of assistance.

Mr. GALLEGOS: Is the Department of Commerce, for example, implementing any kind of studies along these lines?

Mr. LUKSON: Not that I know of.

I can give you one example: the economic development in this region in our own State. They have $13 million, which is a very small amount of money to begin with. But it was designed, as I understand it, to apply to unemployed areas in excess of 6 percent unemployment, which came out of the ARA; and yet $11 million of that $13 million was spent in the Puget Sound area. The big cities got it. What happened?

You know, I think rural areas are being disadvantaged, they do not have the expertise, and maybe perhaps if they do have the expertise, they certainly do not have the funds, and I think that somewhere we have to redirect national policy back toward the rural areas as a partial answer to the urban problem.

Mr. GALLEGOS: Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: I will recognize Mr. Bonnen now.

Mr. BONNEN: I am intrigued by your very strong suggestion that we reverse the flow of this migration, or slow it down at least.

This was also suggested this morning by an anthropologist who said he wanted to see this done, not for economic and social reasons, but he did not know how it could be brought about. This is what puzzles me.

How de we bring this about? What prescription would you present us with for obtaining this objective?

I can see the reasons for not wanting to export rural poverty into urban ghettos, and also the things that would be solved or ameliorated in rural life by not having or by not exporting all of your better trained people in some cases.

Just how would you go about this?

Mr. LUKSON: First of all, I think that through creative federalism, this is entirely possible.

I think it is possible through the decentralization of the industries in urban areas, and I think it is a selling job partially; but also, perhaps we might try a way of tax incentives, for example, to get industry to locate in rural areas. We might better use things like the Small Business Administration and the Economic Development Administration to encourage industry in one form or another to locate into the rural areas.

What is the difference between having a factory located in Yakima, 120 miles from Seattle, than driving through Los Angeles, the City of Los Angeles, for 2½ or 3 hours? The fact is, it is probably a lot more pleasant and probably a lot quicker to get from Seattle to Yakima than it is to get through the City of Los Angeles.

I think there are some very good reasons and some very logical reasons.

Secondly, I think the corporations themselves have to develop, and I think they are developing, a social conscience—at least, I would hope so—in terms of all of this national movement, this national social movement; and they are becoming more and more aware that they have some role to play, and I think this is a selling job to them as well.

Mr. BONNEN: Without going on much further, I asked that question because I have had to face it myself, and you have to convince a lot of people that you are not simply suggesting the creation of a great public welfare program which will support the whole rural life.

This is the kind of reaction you often get. We have to have some very hard reasonable prescriptions for how you are going to bring it about, and it is not only the need to make clear the problem involved and the desirable end, but how we do it; and we have a long way to go.

Mr. LUKSON: Well, I think, of course, that we are looking at —well, I think loans can do it as much as grants; I think that it does not have to be a grant situation in many cases. I think that a loan through various agencies might prove to be the incentive for industry.

Mr. BONNEN: Thank you, Mr. Lukson.

The CHAIRMAN: Any other questions? I will recognize Mr. Gibson.

Mr. GIBSON: Do you have an economic development program? Are you a designated area?

Mr. LUKSON: Yes, we have a chronic unemployment of 9.2 percent.

Mr. GIBSON: Is there an overall economic development program in that area?

Mr. LUKSON: No.

Mr. GIBSON: Is there one in process; is there a local development committee?

Mr. LUKSON: One of the problems has been that under the OERA, the county commissioner or the county superintendent—or whatever it took to initiate the process—our county has not elected to do so; and sometimes it is difficult politically to get the EDA interested in a particular community unless we can get the county interested. And in our county, they have not elected to do so, and this has been one of the problems. I think the EDA is perhaps misconstructed on this basis.

Mr. GIBSON: Have you had any discussions with the EDA field people?

Mr. LUKSON: Yes, many, many times. They have a whole office full of help, and they are interested, you know, but they do not seem to have the expertise and the knowledge that is necessary to assist us.

It is the most frustrating thing that I have ever gone through, working with the EDA. They have things like skill centers and potentially all kinds of things that could be of tremendous assistance. They do not have the funds and they do not have the personnel to implement it.

Mr. GIBSON: If I can recall the legislation accurately—and I may be off here—but it seems to me that it is not legislatively mandatory that the elected government approve the plan. It can be drawn up, and it has to be submitted for comment as I recall to the official government. But, as I recall, the action can be taken if there is a relatively representative local development group, that is my understanding.

This is related to something else in your proposal, which I have scanned very rapidly and I do not have time to do justice to it. But you start off with a recommendation of broad social development, a Department of Social Development, which in effect would encompass the various serving agencies that are functions of the Federal Government in some sort of coordinated, interrelated fashion.

Mr. LUKSON: Yes.

Mr. GIBSON: Again, if I recall the intent of the Community Action Agency, it was indeed to be this kind of hub around which various public and private resources could be funneled to the problems of the poor.

If, then, the Community Action Agency is broadly representative of the community, of various portions of the community—indeed, the comprehensive approach to economic development and so forth is necessary to solve the problems of the poor. It seems that it could become a bona fide function of the Community Action Agency, and perhaps a stipulation, not for the creation of an agency which would dissolve HEW and so forth, but which would make it legislatively mandatory, as now, that the legislation says or recommends that priority be given to CAA-approved and -sponsored projects, perhaps some sort of appendage to legislation in the other departments—enabling legislation in the other departments—which said that "you must" coordinate with or integrate into these kind of programs, then CAA might do what you are saying here.

Mr. LUKSON: It is entirely possible. Something like Senator Muskie's Subcommittee on Interdepartmental Cooperation, or whatever it is called, and certainly I would wholeheartedly recommend the suggestions that he is making, that his committee is making, in terms of doing something very similar to what you just mentioned.

Mr. GIBSON: Now, could I ask again, you had how long—you are the director of the CAA?

Mr. LUKSON: Yes.

Mr. GIBSON: How old is this?

Mr. LUKSON: About a year and a half old.

Mr. GIBSON: Have you had the fight about participation of the poor?

Mr. LUKSON: You mean involvement?

Mr. GIBSON: Right.

Mr. LUKSON: No, we have about, I would say 10 or 12 neighborhood organizations around the county, and neighborhood training, and in most cases the primary aim of our program has been to incorporate these small groups and delegate to them the responsibility of running programs in their particular communities; and this is working out very well.

Mr. **GIBSON**: Now, on the CAA board, how large a board is that?

Mr. **LUKSON**: We have about 38.

Mr. **GIBSON**: How many poor people do you have?

Mr. **LUKSON**: About half; actually, 52 percent.

Mr. **GIBSON**: So you have gone through that process of getting participation of a substantial kind?

Mr. **LUKSON**: Yes.

Mr. **GIBSON**: About when in the—excuse me, how old did you say your CAA was, about how old?

Mr. **LUKSON**: About a year and a half or two years old.

Mr. **GIBSON**: Now, when in that 2-year history did this participation of the poor come about?

Mr. **LUKSON**: You mean, when did it develop within the year and a half or two years?

Mr. **GIBSON**: I do not know if this is true in your case, but it has been my experience and I have been looking at this rather extensively and intensively for a number of months now, and there was a sort of pattern.

I mean, when the legislation first came out, generally the public officials, the mayors and the county people, they appointed prominent citizens to the board which made up the Community Action Agency, and it was only after some period of time had taken place that the fight for substantial participation by the poor occurred.

Now, when that occurred and OEO did insist on that type of representation, it was then generally the pattern in many areas for those prominent citizens to sort of withdraw, either by resigning or just by simply not attending.

Now I am wondering, has this happened to your organization?

Mr. **LUKSON**: No, we have been very fortunate, because it has been between what we call the evolutionaries and the revolutionaries, and there has been a real blending in, I think, of community efforts.

There has been nobody that I know of that has resigned from the board for this reason.

Mr. **GIBSON**: So you have the economic leadership and so forth of the community represented on this board?

Mr. **LUKSON**: Yes.

Mr. **GIBSON**: If there were a Local Development Committee created in your area based on this format, it would be probably from members of your board; is that correct?

Mr. **LUKSON**: Yes. In fact, I don't see why in rural communities, in terms of economic development, in forming Local Development Corporations, the low income groups themselves cannot take the initiative, and they should. I don't see why they cannot; we certainly would do this ourselves.

Mr. **GIBSON**: I see no obstacle, as I recall, in your legislation and the EDA legislation which would prevent your doing exactly that. Have you applied to become a Local Development Agency?

Mr. **LUKSON**: We have several times approached the Economic Development Administration on the possibility of becoming something like you say.

In terms of—well, I am not too clear on their legislation. They agreed to start Economic Development Districts, and I have never seen that part of it get off on four legs.

I am just not at all clear.

We have formed a Local Development Corporation, and we are now at a couple in which we have some low income people on it. The president of the corporation is a member of our board.

No. 1, we still need 15 or 20 percent of local funds in order to get the 75 or 80 percent of the funds that are necessary, and this is a long way to go; and obviously, it does involve the other part of the community.

We have gone so far as to hold a few rummage sales and a few bake sales and things of this nature in an attempt to begin to raise this to create some spirit in the community.

But again, there seems to be, at least in my feelings, something missing; and I am not sure if it is a lack of staff or a lack of understanding as to where that act is going.

Mr. GIBSON: I would suggest that there are a number of steps upon which you could seize the initiative and get it to a point beyond which you would be relying on the lowest echelon staff of EDA, and get it kicked up to a high level for consideration; and there are some kinds of resources which they have which would help you forge a comprehensive program, I believe, without the local share. There is technical assistance available, and so forth.

They have cracked the balance in terms of requirements for applications and so forth, you know, and things that help get it to that stage.

I see a lot of potential. I agree with the concept you have laid out here.

I think there are now possibilities for you to take the initiative and do this type of thing by making CAA or whatever grows out of it into a Local Development Corporation or ARA Redevelopment planning.

Mr. LUKSON: Well, you know, we have an on-the-job training contract now, which I think you need for a rural community; and we are looking at public on-the-job training, which I think would further enhance that. We are taking a look at some other aspects.

But I think that the CAA can become a natural planning agent which could plan change in rural communities; and, hopefully, the sort of thing that Senator Muskie is doing, if this could be brought to his attention, CAA could very well duplicate that kind of record in rural communities; and, if this happened, I think we would have ourselves a real winner.

Mr. GIBSON: Thank you very much.

Mr. STANLEY: Mr. Chairman, may I ask just one question?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. Stanley, go ahead.

Mr. STANLEY: I was just wondering if this end of the table could get in on this colloquy that is going on.

The Redevelopment Act which was signed on May 1, 1961—and I happened to be present when it was signed—but its work has now run its course and EDA has taken its place.

The OED people are essential, or they were essential at one time; but I still serve on the National Advisory Committee of EDA, and I know a little bit about its functions.

But it seems to me—and I am going to ask this as a question —inasmuch as this act has been around this long and you have had chronic unemployment running up to 17 percent, and your community has not been taking advantage of this, I would greatly suspect that you might have a political problem.

Mr. LUKSON: I think you are vaguely correct. I think many rural communities have political problems of this nature.

Mr. STANLEY: Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: All right, Dr. Henderson.

Mr. HENDERSON: I was just interested in your comments about industrial locations, the location of supportive services that could lead to employment, and you made the parallel or the contrast of driving through Los Angeles, that in comparison to locating something like 125 or 150 miles from Seattle.

Off the top of your head, the factors involved in industrial locations, certainly one of those factors is availability of a labor force.

I notice you have a scheme here of a comprehensive manpower program.

Would this in any fashion, in your judgment, affect the location of industry?

Mr. LUKSON: Oh, very definitely. I think if we could go to industry and say that we have any kind of a vocational training program or a vocational training center or that we have a plan or a system, if you want to call it that, by which we can adequately show industry that we have a series of steps which an individual might go through from an unskilled to a skilled position and that we could meet the needs of industry located in our community, I think that is something that we can well sell industry, and something that the industrial or the economic climate of the community, through the chamber of commerce, or what have you, might well have used in their promotions.

I think that this combination of factors would get them.

Mr. HENDERSON: In other words, I guess my whole point here is—well, in my own mind, I really don't have it properly framed —well, at least I do not grasp—I wonder if we are doing enough at the policy level to bring into relationship such things as manpower development training on a large scale and also the kinds of jobs for which people should be trained, and the vocational training programs and so forth, the things that would attract industry.

In other words, an initial comprehensive contact and how it would be applied to rural poverty.

For example, we know in the Appalachia program that we have a plan eventually to develop a superstructure of progress and so forth within this certain district.

I did not know whether you could pursue this or not as applied to your area. I just wanted to get your reaction on it.

Mr. LUKSON: You mean, in terms of the comprehensive program?

Mr. HENDERSON: Yes, this was your main thesis; this is one of the main points you have been making. I just wanted you to enlarge on it a little bit more as to this whole question of manpower and what kinds of industry. For example, you know about the MDTA training programs and the training for the over-age, people being trained for the hedgehopping type of industry or firms, that really do not mean anything in the first place.

But when it comes down to the heavy manufacturing firms, it is really not the function of MDTA for that type of training.

Mr. LUKSON: Yes, that's right.

Mr. HENDERSON: This is usually what you have there already.

Mr. LUKSON: Yes.

Mr. HENDERSON: I am talking of perhaps some type of engineering components and so forth.

Mr. LUKSON: Yes, I understand.

Mr. HENDERSON: A lot of these do not get to rural poverty in the sense that it would take a large plant, for instance, employing as many as 2,400 people; this would be a firm, a very large firm, manufacturing something like heavy machinery and equipment.

Mr. LUKSON: Yes.

Mr. HENDERSON: This would require a lot of highly trained and skilled personnel.

Mr. LUKSON: Well, first of all, we are not going to see heavy industry coming, you know, immediately into a community that is considered rural in nature. I think maybe perhaps we might see some light manufacturing firms coming in first. In other words, I think there is a growing process here, too.

Mr. HENDERSON: What about satellite-type firms?

Mr. LUKSON: Yes, yes.

Mr. HENDERSON: Suppose for example—well, did you say that Puget Sound is a heavy industrialized area?

Mr. LUKSON: Yes.

Mr. HENDERSON: That is a heavy industrialized area, with such things as a Boeing Company plant?

Mr. LUKSON: Yes, it is heavily industrialized.

Mr. HENDERSON: Is there any possibility of satellite industries?

Mr. LUKSON: Yes, a classic example is an outfit in Cleveland that makes parts for Boeing, and they are now moving to Seattle. They are a subcontractor, and they are looking at something within, let us say, 30 or 40 miles of Seattle; and they are still looking at the suburbs of Seattle, and Yakima is 120 or 130 miles away.

I am saying that as to mileage, it may turn out economically to their benefit; but, socially, if there is any social conscience on the part of industry, they certainly could consider our area.

Mr. HENDERSON: All right, thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Lukson, for your report and also for your fine presentation, and we also want to thank you for your patience.

Mr. LUKSON: Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Now we will hear from Tom Martinez, Community Service Center, Bakersfield, Calif. Mr. Martinez will speak to us on antipoverty work in a Mexican-American community.

Go right ahead, Mr. Martinez.

Mr. MARTINEZ: All right, thank you.

STATEMENT OF TOM E. MARTINEZ

Mr. MARTINEZ: I am Tom E. Martinez, director, Community Service Center, 1206 Baker Street, Bakersfield, Calif., and my presentation is about CSO (Community Service Organization).

WHAT IS CSO? CSO is a nonpartisan and a nonsectarian organization. It is neither a political movement nor a relief agency. It is a self-help, civic action group endeavoring to improve living conditions; to promote intercommunity harmony; to work for adequate education and youth-welfare programs; to remedy and prevent violations of human and civil rights; and to provide a medium for social expression and leadership development.

How CSO Was Born.—The formation of CSO grew out of recognition of a serious need to bring together the most civic-minded elements in communities inhabited generally by Americans of Mexican descent in order to form a civic action group to integrate the Spanish-speaking people into the overall community life.

Accomplishments.—The CSO, through its active committees, has made tremendous gains in community betterment, achievement of civil rights, Americanization, education, voter registration, health and welfare, and bringing about a better understanding of people toward one another.

The following are some of the most active projects: public relations, naturalization, education, youth, neighborhood improvement, manpower, expediting, employment, health and welfare, voter registration, civil rights.

Progress.—The Community Service Organization offers real hope for the progress of a million Americans of Mexican descent in California. It looks as if it has struck deep roots in the life of the State. It is developing a considerable number of young and determined leaders with practical objectives in view.

Our problems and obstacles have been many, but through hard work and perseverance by many of our leaders we are arousing and holding the interest of our people. Now there is new feeling because we are getting together for a common and worthwhile cause. We know that our program is sound and that our aims are high. We must work hard to convey our message to other groups and organizations so that they may stand with us and help us whenever possible, and we in turn help them.

Endorsements.—The Community Service Organization is endorsed by Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish church leaders; prominent people in business, professional, civic, and political life; in addition to both central labor bodies in California A.F. of L. and CIO.

CSO Declares War on Poverty.—The Community Service Organization, a delegate under the agency of the community action program of the Office of Economic Opportunity, will embark to provide every basic help to the poor people as far as referral and counseling is concerned. This organization is concerned to the plight of the poor Mexican Americans and other poverty minorities of Kern County. This particular minority, which is 10 percent of Kern County's population, has suffered quite severely from both causes and effects of poverty.

According to the 1960 census figures, the median income of this group for males over 14 years of age was $2,623. The general educational level has been much lower than county average but is similar to that of other minorities. The problem of poverty for Mexican Americans is complicated by the fact that they tend to have larger families than the rest of the population.

The point here of these statistics form a conclusion that there is a large number of poor people in Kern County who need help.

(A) *Language Barriers.*—A typical Kern County Mexican American speaks Spanish only and is unable to communicate when he needs assistance from a private or local agency.

(B) *Fear.*—There are innumerable cases when medical attention was not sought because of the cost involved.

(C) *Problems With the Law.*—Prior experience of the Community Service Organization shows a definite need if sound advice is not sought at the right time. A typical case to illustrate the point is a person who has legalized papers served on him and he puts them down as if they never existed. Although he may have been innocent, his absence from the court at a proper time gets him in a "lot of hot water." This all includes traffic tickets, driving without a license, and so forth. This constitutes a heavy burden which will be avoided with an alert neighborhood worker or a community aid worker.

(D) *Lack of Knowledge.*—There is ample evidence that there are people over 65 who should be receiving either old age assistance or social security who are a burden to their families who also live on a meager income. The CSO worker will unearth many of these problems of the people who will need special attention.

(E) *Susceptibility to Frauds.*—Although swindling is on the decline due to laws and Better Business Bureaus, there are still many smooth operators in business. Community service workers can help resolve many of these cases.

(A) Community Service Organization.
  (1) Structure
  (2) Services
    (a) Basic help to poor people
    (b) Referral and counseling.
(B) Mainly concerned with—
  (1) Plight of Mexican American
  (2) This minority has suffered from both causes and effects.
(C) Complexity of poverty
  (1) Language barriers
  (2) Fear
  (3) Lack of information—knowledge
  (4) Ignorance need basic elementary help, as ignorance goes hand in hand with poverty, they are more susceptible to frauds.
(D) Objectives
  (1) CSO must continue to serve, because of the above needs
  (2) In 10 years of CSO work here in California an enormous amount of valuable experience has been gained.
  (3) With the present proper staff we can provide adequate help at the opportune time.

(E) Future plans—The CSO Center has plans for the future when they shall mold from general counseling services to specialized services in several strategically located service centers.

(F) Whenever it is financially feasible for the CSO, it shall bring about multiple service centers.

I think I have covered most of the things that I came here to talk about.

I do not have any suggestions as to what is wrong with the poverty program with the exception of the survey that was conducted in the East, but I believe those same circumstances affect the west coast as well as the east coast.

Thank you very much, gentlemen.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Martinez, have you given us a copy of the report that you have read regarding the work your organization is doing?

Mr. MARTINEZ: Yes, I have.

The CHAIRMAN: We really appreciate it, and I think your organization as well as many others in the field should be commended for the work that is being done. They are badly needed.

As you know, people begin to have a lack of understanding, they seem to have a little fear sometimes, and I think organizations of people such as your own organization, are to be commended for the work you are doing in that connection.

Do we have any questions by any member of the Commission?

Mr. GALLEGOS: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: All right, go ahead, Mr. Gallegos.

Mr. GALLEGOS: I was very interested in your comments as to two of your contributions to CSO with regard to this matter.

Do you feel that more programs should be set up that will give the individual more help; or should help be made available to organizations so that they can go out and make themselves more effective and help them to develop so they can maybe do those things which can develop agencies in communities where people can help themselves?

Where do you place your emphasis of effort in this connection?

Mr. MARTINEZ: Well, I think I did not make myself clear here perhaps. But the way I see it—this is the way I see the situation: Every individual has a pressing problem right at the moment. It may be lack of education; it may be a job; or what have you.

So every case has to be evaluated at its present circumstances right at the moment.

In other words, we can't very well plan for the future because we know the poverty program may not be here 5 years or 10 years from now; so it is not a long program, but it may be a starter.

But if we reach the point where we don't need it any more, that is fine. But we try to take those problems right then and there and then perhaps if they have a little problem, we will go take them one at a time, and I think that in the end, we will say that whenever we reach our point of this particular person being—well, should we say reached the point where this person is standing on his own two feet, then we can come to the conclusion that the case has been closed as far as aid, if he has been able to help himself at that point.

Then I think that whatever a person contributes to society, when he is in a position to contribute to society, then society will help him in return.

Mr. GALLEGOS: Well, I note that Governor Reagan ordered some of the one-stop centers closed, I think they call them multiservice centers, and these are one-stop offices where a person in the community could go and receive the services of some 9 or 10 State agencies who were housed in that one building.

I believe Bakersfield was one of those communities, was it not?

Mr. MARTINEZ: Yes.

Mr. GALLEGOS: Will the closing of that office have any effect on the people who needed that service; or do you feel that that service should be set up in cities; or do you think there are other ways of handling it?

Mr. **MARTINEZ**: I believe that they should be able to operate, they should exist, because the more agencies, regardless of whether it be funded from State or Federal, the more people that take an active part in helping the poverty-stricken people, the quicker we will get the results that we are looking for.

Mr. **GALLEGOS**: Do you think the closing of that office will hurt substantially; or do you think it will have little or no effect?

Mr. **MARTINEZ**: Well, let me put it this way. It won't help; so if it remains open, it will be of benefit.

Mr. **GALLEGOS**: Thank you very much.

The **CHAIRMAN**: Are there any other questions? (No response.)

Thank you, Mr. Martinez.

It has now taken us more than 13 hours to receive testimony from our scheduled witnesses.

We are going to have to recess this hearing until 8:30 tomorrow morning, when we will take up again.

I want to thank you for being here and giving us the benefit of your reports.

Of course, be sure and leave behind a copy of your report, Mr. Martinez, and we certainly do appreciate it.

Mr. **MARTINEZ**: Thank you.

The **CHAIRMAN**: To those of you who have been in attendance and, of course, to members of the staff here who have helped us so much, we certainly do appreciate it. Of course, there are many of us here who have not even had supper yet. So we will now recess this hearing until 8:30 tomorrow morning.

(Whereupon, at 10:00 p.m. on Thursday, January 26, 1967, the hearing was adjourned to reconvene at 8:30 a.m. on Friday, January 27, 1967, in the same place.)

January 27, 1967

Chairman Laurel: I would like for this hearing to come to order; we have a long day ahead of us.

I would like to welcome you this morning, ladies and gentlemen, and we would like to open up once again President Johnson's National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty.

This is our second day here in Tucson, Ariz.

The main purpose, of course, is set out in the charge to the Commission by the President, and this Commission was created by Executive order, and signed last fall; and it is for the specific purpose of looking into the problems that are affecting the rural areas of our country.

In that connection, we had a 13½-hour session which allowed us to receive testimony yesterday from different people—professionals, educators, and people who are experiencing the difficulties of living in some of the poverty pockets, and we know that they exist in different communities all over the country.

We would like to first open up this hearing again this morning. This will be our last day in Tucson, Ariz.

I would like to set out some guidelines more or less as a criterion by which we will be ruled throughout the day in hearing this testimony.

We would respectfully request of those who will appear before the Commission, we would inform you that you will be allowed 15 minutes to give oral testimony, and giving the members of the Commission at least 10 or 15 minutes for some questions. I know the difficulty that is involved in adhering so closely to such a schedule, but we have a field trip that we have to take this afternoon and we are scheduled to leave at 3 o'clock, so we will close our session at 3 o'clock.

If we are to make our deadline, we will have to adhere to the rules which are being called to your attention at this time.

I will, if you will allow me, give you a 3-minute warning before your 15-minute presentation period is up, keeping in mind, of course, that it is not our purpose to embarrass you or to in any way detract from the importance of your own testimony, but merely for the reason that it is essential that we adhere to some kind of a time schedule.

As far as the Commission is concerned, with regard to requesting cooperation, maybe we can refrain from asking any more than two questions by each Commissioner so that the other members and the people also may be given an equal opportunity. All members are invited to ask the questions they have on their minds, keeping in mind also that we do not want to restrict discussion any more than we absolutely have to, but we are called upon to have some semblance of rule and order that will prevail here today.

So, with that in mind, we will then call and the Commission will receive now the testimony of Mr. Norman W. Todd, the executive director of the Tucson Committee for Economic Opportunity, and we will recognize Mr. Todd at this time.

STATEMENT OF NORMAN H. TODD

STATEMENT OF NORMAN H. TODD on behalf of A. Alan Hanshaw, president, Committee for Economic Opportunity, Inc.

Mr. TODD: First, I will give you some background on our organization.

No. 1. Background.

a. Initial organization.

The Committee for Economic Opportunity is the local community action agency for Tucson and Pima County.

It was organized informally in June of 1964 when the Economic Opportunity Act was under discussion in Congress. After passage of the act on August 20, 1964, the committee was formally incorporated on December 9, 1964. Application was made for a program development grant, which became effective April 1, 1965. Immediate application was made for further grants, and a total of $745,000 in OEO funds was made available during fiscal year 1965.

During fiscal year 1966 a total of $1,247,000 had been authorized by OEO as the Federal share of ongoing projects.

b. Structure.

The board of directors of the Committee for Economic Opportunity is composed of 40 members, 14 of which are representatives of the poor.

We have seven neighborhood area councils located primarily on the west side of Tucson which encompass a total of 28,000 people consisting of 12,000 families as of 1960 census. Each area council has two representatives on our board of directors. Each area council is a separate delegate agency for its portion of our area councils project and administers the area council office, the two employees of which are paid for from OEO funds. In effect, each area council office attempts to serve as a multiservice center, although we do not have enough personnel and space or time to really serve in that capacity to any degree.

No. 2. Programs.

A majority of our programs are educational in nature. Specifically we have the following programs which are of this type:

a. Headstart school district No. 1 provided preschool training for 5-year-olds during 1965 for 640 children. In 1966 this was cut back to 120 children because of the increase in the standards of the Headstart program. and lack of funds.

b. Headstart for Sahuarita in 1965 provided for 17 children 4 to 5 years of age, primarily of Mexican-American culture. They had already provided from local funds a kindergarten school for 5-year-olds, but under present Arizona State law the school buildings could not be used nor could teachers be paid from local school district funds for the education of children below the age of 5.

c. Leadership Training was a program whereby we trained six different classes of 40 members each at night for 3 months. The training covered the various community services available in Tucson, and provided them with the basic information necessary to become community organization aids and work in the area councils. However, due to the fact that no money was available for employment as community organization aids the first year, the training was dead end, so to speak. That is, no jobs were available at the end of the training.

d. Home Management Training. This project, operated by the YWCA, was geared to teach domestic activities such as sewing and cooking to members of low income families who needed the skills to improve their family life. This project operated in 1965 but was phased out by the OEO regional office in 1966 because of low priority status and shortage of funds.

e. Credit Unions. We have four credit unions for the four original area councils, and this project plans to educate the members in consumer education and the necessity for learning to save through their own organization. It also provides them with a low interest source of funds.

f. Summer Headstart programs operated in both 1965 and 1966 and served approximately 770 children in four different school districts, including district No. 1, Amphitheater school district, Marana school district, and Sunnyside school district. Public schools in each of these districts was the delegate agency.

For reasons of their own, the Sahuarita school district and Marana school district have withdrawn from further participation in the Headstart programs. In the Marana school district, Catholic Charities of Tucson have consented to serve as delegate agency for the 1967 summer Headstart program.

No. 3. Estimate of success of these programs.

a. Of the above programs, we feel that the Headstart program has been very successful in taking children 5 years of age and giving them the benefit of kindergarten training prior to entry into the first grade. School districts indicate that the children generally are better prepared and do not require assignment to category 1-C classes which have been maintained by school district No. 1 for the last 35 years, primarily for Spanish-speaking children.

b. This community has felt that the home management training project was reasonably successful and did provide additional instruction which was appreciated by the wives in low income families who received it. This program may be continued on a local basis if funds can be obtained for it.

c. Leadership training program has been successful in giving the trainees a better understanding of the local agencies that provide various services for the poor in the community.

d. The credit unions have not been as successful as would be desired. The problem of motivating low income families to join credit unions for their own benefit is difficult. Apparently low income families generally distrust any efforts to improve their lot on the part of the so-called establishment. Consumer education in this area is badly needed to enable the poor to make the best use of their money, and to eliminate payment of interest rates as high as 40 percent per year, which further deplete their meager dollar resources.

No. 4. Integration of the rural poor in our urban community.

a. The population increase in the urban area of Tucson from April 1, 1960, to October 1, 1965, a period of 5½ years between censuses, was 26,000. This is an average of approximately 5,000 per year. How many of these are rural poor migrating to the city because of loss of jobs in rural areas, we don't know. We do know that the only agency which offers a major effort toward meeting the needs for these people, the Salvation Army, is not able to cope with all of their needs.

b. The problem of integrating the children of rural families into the Tucson urban community schools again is a difficult one. If these children have been going to schools in smaller communities prior to their moving to the Tucson urban area, it is very likely that the standards of those schools are lower than that of the Tucson schools. Therefore, the children again would be placed at a disadvantage in fulfilling their role as an equal member in classes of their same age group.

c. Since the rural poor who move to Tucson pay little or no property taxes to assist in supporting the school districts, the added burden of instructing their children is placed on the community as a whole. Many of these rural poor are members of economically disadvantaged ethnic groups such as the Mexican-American, Indian, and Negro races.

d. Rural poor entering an urban community generally enter at the bottom of the labor pool, lack knowledge of money management, and have different behavior standards than the poor of the urban community. They immediately present disproportionate welfare charges and their delinquency rate is generally higher.

e. School superintendents attempt to test new children so as to place them in classes appropriate to their educational ability. However, this often means that the children of the rural poor will be in classes with much younger children.

f. Average school health programs are generally not adequate for the major health needs of the rural poor coming into an urban community.

No. 5. Educational problems of migrant families.

a. Educational problems for the children of true migrant families are undoubtedly great. Generally, migrant families stay in a single place for periods of 3 to 8 months at a time, and then move to other locations. Obviously, their children come into such community schools as may be available, on a very limited or part-time basis, because of the difficulty of transportation to the schools, as well as the extra problems which the children would have of meeting the standards of the local schools.

b. Other testimony given before this Commission has explained the great need for adult education classes for the majority of the migrant families.

No. 6. Modification of programs for the coming year.

a. Our experience with the leadership training program to date indicates that it is not wise to train people for nonexistent jobs, even as community organization aids. Therefore, in program year "B" which for us will begin on April 1, 1967, we plan on redirecting the emphasis of the leadership training program towards the problems of:

(1) Providing in-service training to employees of our area council offices.

(2) General instruction to low income members of the executive boards of the neighborhood area councils and other delegate

agencies, such as the four credit unions, and the parent advisory committees of the Headstart classes.

b. This training is planned on a rather general basis to provide them with:

(1) A means of developing leadership and knowledge, such as how to participate in democratically operated community action organizations.

(2) Better knowledge of the services available to low income members in the community from presently operating organizations such as the welfare department, health department, employment service, and so forth.

(3) Learning how they can best fulfill the OEO directive of maximum feasible participation of the poor.

c. Since the majority of the "poor" poor in this community are hounded by such immediate problems as where the next meal is coming from, they oftentimes do not participate in community organization work, even though offered the opportunity, because they do not have sufficient funds to pay for the gas and oil to attend meetings, or babysitting charges so that they may leave their families under proper care while attending such meetings.

d. There is need for some kind of stipend to pay these low income members of the various groups for their participation, to give them some compensation for the time that they spend in their own betterment.

No. 7. Effects of 1966 EOA amendments.

a. The October 1966 EOA amendments had two serious effects insofar as our community is concerned.

(1) We were told that four programs were of low priority and therefore would not be refunded. These were:

(a) The summer day camp sponsored by the Catholic Youth Organization where some 2,000 children participated in 2 weeks of summer recreation.

(b) Tucson Child Guidance Outpost Service, which provides psychiatric care and attention for children of low income families who need the services.

(c) The Homemaker Service sponsored by the Pima County Department of Public Welfare, which provides emergency homemaker services for members of low income families.

(d) The Volunteer Bureau sponsored by the Tucson Community Council, which provided a means of placing those who desire to volunteer their services in one of the many community agencies where their services are needed.

(2) The local community action agency has been denied the opportunity of funding those projects which to our people were of the highest priority. The amount of our so-called versatile funds of $368,000 for the next year provides little more than the amount needed for the area council offices and conduct and administration of the central office.

b. Concept of community action—to solve the problems of its own individual members—appears to be one of the most effective social innovations to receive national recognition.

The earmarking of funds by Congress and dismemberment of OEO by giving programs to other agencies, such as the Department of Labor, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and Department of Agriculture, is placing a dagger in the heart of the community action effort. Unless a reversal of policy is made, it is likely that this extremely worthwhile program will receive a major setback.

This effort needs to be encouraged and supported from top to bottom because it is only through the improvement of all the individual members of our society that this nation can truly become and remain great.

With the permission of the Chairman, I would like to take a few minutes to enlarge on some thoughts which I first expressed a year ago when Congressman Schroeder of New York stopped in Tucson to visit with Mrs. Beauregard and me.

In order to introduce these thoughts properly, may I throw out a few questions for the Commission to consider.

There are some 22,000 credit unions in the United States already and their total assets I believe run around $9 to $10 billion. I have not seen the latest compilation this year.

But, what would be the effect of $12 billion added to this credit union structure per year with every citizen as a shareholder? What would be the effect if we had $12 billion added to the Mutual No-Loan Funds Area every year, again with every citizen as a shareholder?

What effect would $36 billion in local tax sources have, again contributions from every citizen, what effect would this have on local city and county services? What effect would $60 billion, again contributions from every citizen, do toward improvement of the health, education and welfare of every citizen?

Now, we can add to these, what would be the effect of an additional $120 billion of extra purchasing power do to our economy?

President Johnson is claiming that there will be an increase in our Gross National Product of some $43 billion this year, bringing it up to in the neighborhood of roughly $580 billions.

If we add all of these others that I have mentioned, it will be another $240 billion a year added to our gross national product which would bring it up in the neighborhood of $820 billion per year.

The problem of enlisting the minds of all of our citizens in solving not only our national problems but our local problems, the local aspects of them, and I think we should employ the technique of "brainstorming," which I am sure all of you have heard.

Very briefly, the "brainstorming" technique provides for the delineation of a problem on the board, and then understanding on the part of the group participating in the "brainstorming" session of the fact of the rules which are: No. 1, that no criticism will be allowed of any of the ideas suggested for a solution of the problem until all ideas have been exhausted. Then, No. 2, after all ideas have been exhausted, a critical review of the various solutions by the group will be permitted, putting a plus after those ideas which are potentially feasible, and a minus after those ideas which the group agrees are no good, and a question mark after those which the group has not yet determined whether they will be good or bad.

Using this technique in our local community action agencies and other groups at the local community level, I feel that our citizens are capable of arriving at the solutions to their local problems to a much better degree than the so-called experts in Washington.

I am not belittling any of their efforts, believe me, but they are not familiar with the local conditions, and not being familiar, it is difficult for them 3,000 miles away to understand everything that is needed at the local level.

To sum this up now, I have opened the area for possible questions, and I would like to state that yesterday, this Commission was bombarded with many, many problems but no solutions.

I think that you would be interested in considering possible solutions.

Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Todd.

Now, we will allow 5 minutes for essential questions by members of the Commission at this time.

First, to my left, Dr. Roessel.

Mr. ROESSEL: Mr. Todd, you pointed out very eloquently the dagger at the heart, you might say, of community action, but there is earmarking of the funds and there is a possibility of dismemberment of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

I would like to ask you what the so-called poor people of this area are doing, what are these people doing in terms of letting their feelings be known in Washington?

I feel that you certainly expressed very admirably your feelings here; but I think that if the feelings that you expressed were expressed by 100 million people in the United States, these things wouldn't happen; and, I am just wondering, are the people who are affected by these programs heard, are their voices heard in Washington, and if so, how?

Mr. TODD: My opinion, Dr. Roessel, is that this has not become an effective tool as yet because many of the poor are not familiar with the techniques of even writing their Congressman, and of the value which could be obtained by so doing.

Congressman Udall in his recent letter admirably pointed out these various things and made suggestions as to how each and every member of Arizona can write to their Congressman and provide their Congressman with their points of view. He discouraged form letters and said that form letters generally get form answers.

He wanted individual thoughts expressed by individual constituents.

But again, how do you motivate the poor to do this? As you heard yesterday, many of these poor are uneducated.

So, how do you get the man who has had only a fifth grade education to understand that this is a part of his country and he is part of it.

Mr. ROESSEL: I was impressed so greatly yesterday not by the inadequacy of their education, although as to formal education it may have been inadequate, but I was impressed by the depth of their wisdom, and it would seem to me that these kinds of individuals can be reached, and certainly I would think could be made to understand the importance of these particular things in terms of the things that they think are important.

So, I may not be quite as pessimistic as you are.

Mr. TODD: I do not see how you could get the impression that I am pessimistic, but I am concerned with the amount of time and effort it takes to educate these people and give them this information and instruction.

Mr. **ROESSEL**: All right, sir, thank you.

The **CHAIRMAN**: All right, Dr. Henderson.

Mr. **HENDERSON**: I have just two questions.

Now, Mr. Todd, the first two questions are not part of my two questions.

Were you in the collection agency business or the finance business or anything similar to that before you took this job with the community action agency?

Mr. **TODD**: I became associated with credit unions when they first came up 29 years ago.

Mr. **HENDERSON**: You were in the currency lending business?

Mr. **TODD**: Not in the business as such. I was a president of a board of directors in some private credit unions, and I am familiar with their procedures.

Mr. **HENDERSON**: I just mention it for emphasis.

I was also interested in contrasts between the success of your venture here in Tucson at the credit union, and the one presented by Mrs. Rodriquez, I believe it was, from Guadalupe, where they went from approximately $55 to assets of $22,000 and they did it in a little over a year.

Your concern was the lack of motivation, and in their case and I do not know what the reason was, but you might want to check it.

Mr. **TODD**: We have.

Mr. **HENDERSON**: I thought it was very striking, the very quick accumulation of assets in this particular credit union.

My main point though is this: I was concerned with your, well, I guess you might say, treatment of the matter of migration from the rural to the urban areas, and particularly the adjustment of persons to the school system and the response of the school system to the problems of adjustment.

I get concerned about the whole question, the whole matter that some people present of class depreciation in schools, as much as I do or as much as I am concerned with the whole question of racial depreciation in schools; and, I am gathering from your testimony that you do not see or do not view with any degree of optimism programing for adjustments along democratic lines of the persons from the rural areas.

Tucson apparently is not a town to pattern the formula that would lead to a successful adjustment of persons who migrate from the rural areas, is this correct?

Mr. **TODD**: Not under the present circumstances, that is, of our social and economic system; you are correct.

Mr. **HENDERSON**: What happens to these people when they come in? We are concerned here about the rural problems of poverty, and one of the critical factors that we are concerned with is not just rural poverty but urban poverty; even though we are called a rural commission, we are concerned with both.

The whole question involves the adjustment of workers; the adjustment of school age children; the adjustment of family matters and home life; but, from what I gather here, you would advocate—or do you suggest a type of school arrangement whereby you would separate these people completely by class, are you suggesting that?

Mr. TODD: No, sir, I am not.

I feel that this is a problem where, if these other economic conditions which I mentioned very briefly were brought about, would be capable of being solved very readily by each individual member.

Let me explain perhaps that, so far as the question has been raised as to how this $240 billion is going to be made available——

Mr. HENDERSON (interrupting): Well, I have some notions about that, I happen to be an economist myself.

You see, I think that your—

Well, I will not go into that, if we started talking about this $240 billion, we could stay here all day on that one subject.

But the Phoenix school system, in other words—I am sorry, I do not mean the Phoenix school system—the Tucson school system in your judgment has been unsuccessful in coping with the problems of rural migrants into the school system in the urban area?

Mr. TODD: I am not an educator and I would not care to comment or to express my thought on that particular phase of it at this time.

Mr. HENDERSON: I drew that conclusion from one of your statements.

Mr. TODD: All right.

Mr. HENDERSON: Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions? (No response.)

Apparently not, and we thank you very much, Mr. Todd. We appreciate your appearance.

Now, you did make available a copy of your statement that you can leave with us, did you not?

Mr. TODD: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Todd.

The Commission now will recognize Rev. George L. Phearson, migrant opportunity program, from Phoenix, Ariz.

Now, you have 15 minutes assigned to you, Reverend Phearson, and we would appreciate it if you could give us a copy of your presentation.

Mr. PHEARSON: Yes, I have given several copies to the staff and the press and to members of the Commission.

The CHAIRMAN: All right, thank you. You go right ahead and make your statement.

Mr. PHEARSON: My report this morning is going to be a simple one because we are recommending a simple project, and what I am going to do is to tell you the story of how we are working, and respond thence to the project. Perhaps out of my responsiveness, we may glean some of the problem areas that we are feeling and feinting.

The CHAIRMAN: All right, Reverend Phearson, you may make your presentation in any manner you see fit; we will not restrict you.

STATEMENT OF GEORGE L. PHEARSON

Mr. PHEARSON: I am Rev. George L. Phearson, director, On-the-Job Training—Mobility.

As a private contractor sponsored by the Arizona Council of Churches and funded by the United States Department of Labor, it is our responsibility to conduct a demonstration project in the field of labor mobility as it relates to the migrant workers. The migrant worker, sometimes referred to as a "stoop laborer," is primarily, in our Southwest area, Mexican American and to a lesser degree, Negro. The target areas of the project are: Maricopa County as it relates to Phoenix, Ariz.; Stanfield and Eloy, Ariz., in Pinal County as these communities relate to Casa Grande; and Marana, Ariz., in Pima County as it relates to Tucson.

To create a more workable project we are supported by the Department of Vocational Education, the Employment Service, the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, and the migrant opportunity program. Before launching the project, it was determined that:

No. 1, no family could relocate without bona-fide employment; the employment to be considered "on-the-job training." At this point we are supported by, and follow the ground rules of, the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training.

No. 2, recognizing that the applicant, from the broad category of migrants, in many cases is not job ready, it was felt wise to have a period of 4 to 16 weeks of basic education. This phase is supported by the Department of Vocational Education.

The program, labor-mobility, is a component of the umbrella organization named "migrant opportunity program" (MOP). Other components of MOP are day care and adult education, funded by Title III of the Office of Economic Opportunity; and Community Organization-Job Preparation, funded by Title II of OEO.

By way of summary: the migrant opportunity program is sponsored in its entirety by the Arizona Council of Churches, with two component areas funded by OEO and one component funded by the United States Department of Labor.

Perhaps an outline of the workflow would best illustrate the operations of the mobility project. We shall use for our fictitious case the name of Garcia.

No. 1, Mr. and Mrs. Garcia and six children are recruited by the community organizer of the migrant opportunity program organization. (The community organizer is supported by Title II monies.)

No. 2, the Garcias are interviewed, counseled by the labor-mobility staff. They conclude that Mr. Garcia is not job ready, although he professes a desire to leave stoop labor work for urban employment.

No. 3, he is referred to the basic education class, which is conducted by the Department of Vocational Education. During this period of time a labor-mobility counselor continues to befriend the family as they face together the issues and the problems of relocation.

No. 4, as Mr. Garcia begins to move in the direction of job readiness, a job counselor develops, on behalf of Mr. Garcia, a job interview. Mr. Garcia then executed the responsibility of showing up for the interview. If he is hired, he then becomes an on-the-job trainee and the necessary contracts are developed between the employer, the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, and the labor-mobility project.

No. 5, the labor-mobility counselor works with the Garcias in finding housing and fitting together a program that results in a physical relocation which, generally speaking, is within a radius of 35 miles. Although the mileage is nominal, the transition from labor-camp living and pressures to urban life and pressures is beyond comparison.

No. 6, the labor-mobility counselor and job counselor continue with supportive services for the entire family while they continue to "settle in."

At this writing the project is 6 months old and we are facing the following problems:

First, in the field of job training the concepts of profit motives and productivity which characterize the business world are difficult for us to surmount, since our recruits are considered the severely disadvantaged.

Second, job entry requirements with large industry create untold problems as we endeavor to bring the fieldworker up to a point of eligibility. Facing and helping to solve the trainee's problems of transportation, access to the job, having enough food to exist until payday are ever-recurring issues.

Third, the academic problem of successfully matching the proper trainee to the proper job.

Fourth, the financial formula for mobility is helpful when it comes to moving, but woefully inadequate when the trainee is deeply in debt and lacking transportation.

Fifth, we are experiencing difficulties in the trainees' ability to attend the education classes and continue to live in a labor camp. Generally speaking, residency is predicated upon the concept of working for the camp owner.

Sixth, the whole process of timing is a recurring problem; i.e., the right time to be recruited, placed in vocational educational classes, placed on the job, and ultimately moved.

Seventh, finding adequate housing, facing trainee indebtedness, learning to budget with low entry wages, loneliness are continuing areas of concern.

Generally speaking the labor-mobility project is a sophisticated project with complicated relationships, record-keeping, and contractual requirements. While this sophistication is workable and necessary for an affluent society, it becomes almost a deterrent as we endeavor to face simple situations, but with far-reaching ramifications, that are characteristic in a general way of the fieldworker.

Mr. GALLEGOS: The statement you made about on-the-job training program, did you say there were 85 placements made through the migrant program, or is this the total for the State of Arizona?

Mr. PHEARSON: Oh, no, our present contract with OJT which was dated the 20th of April, we have made within our program 85 placements, and training in 75 different business houses.

Mr. GALLEGOS: What does your contract call for?

Mr. PHEARSON: Oh, our present contract calls for starting out with 120 slots, and it was amended to 180, and the contract I think expires in June of 1966—no, it expires next June, it expires in June of 1967.

Mr. **Gallegos**: Then, I would ask my question regarding OJT.

What do you feel has been the response of private industry to OJT in general; and then, do you feel that there should be greater emphasis made in industrial language training and basic English and in the preparation of the basic fundamental skills that would then enable a person to move into OJT or would you indicate a program?

Mr. **Phearson**: We need, when we think in terms of large industry, we somehow need a program that can bring our type of person up to the level of GED.

Now, it is possible to get some large industries to bend a little bit at the point of the requirement of a high school diploma or GED.

But they cannot afford to bend too far or our particular migrants cannot make it on the job because of other pressures. We need some type of basic education and job preparation and orientation ahead of time that can get them up to that level where they can pass examinations and meet the entry requirements.

Mr. **Gallegos**: Do you have a specific program in mind?

Mr. **Phearson**: We have, I think, a workable pattern within our organization because we do have a basic education counterpart and we have a job preparation counterpart.

But to have enough money to use as stipends, and a long enough period of time to do the job, that is our problem.

It would be very fine, almost delightful, if Washington would give us a 5-year contract with X number of dollars. You work a year at a time, and the contract comes in a couple of months late, and then you work 4 or 5 months and then you get concerned about the next contract; and you cannot get a long-range program, and unless this comes, it is unrealistic to be able to get the migrant to come up to a point of productivity.

You heard Leonard yesterday—well, it scares me to death. Here he is in the City of Tucson and you have heard his testimony; so I ask myself the question, is he really ready to be here in Tucson.

The **Chairman**: Thank you, Mr. Phearson.

Mr. **King**: May I ask just one question?

The **Chairman**: Yes, you may.

Mr. **King**: Reverend Phearson, all through the day yesterday and also this morning there has been sort of a thread woven, and as a layman, I have sort of interpreted the feeling that too many of these things are on a short-term basis; so if this Commission were to make a recommendation, for example, to extend these programs, would you in your work suggest that perhaps we in our work might think in terms of some of these worthwhile programs being put on a longer term basis?

Mr. **Phearson**: Very much so. I would feel, and I am labor oriented, that the simplest solution to a war on poverty is to put people to work so that they can make money; and when they make money, they begin to face the pressures of life and then they grow as new individuals.

To get them to the point of being able to go to work is going to have to take a longer period of time.

Mr. **King**: It is sort of like when a Congressman gets elected, as soon as he learns his job, he has to start to try to be reelected; and, you are in the position that as soon as you get your funds, then you have to spend more time in order to get refunded again, is that correct?

Mr. PHEARSON: Precisely, that is very true.

Mr. KING: Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: We gave you three questions last time, Dr. Henderson, and this time we will give you just one.

Mr. HENDERSON: This is just like "What's My Line?"

No. 1, the OJT program which you do simultaneously with the Friendship Apprenticeship Training program, you actually pay the wages for the persons you place on the jobs, is that correct?

Mr. PHEARSON: No, there must be a bona-fide job opening, and they must go to work as a new employee, with all of the rights and privileges; and then, we reimburse the business for their training costs.

Mr. HENDERSON: That is the point I wanted to get into. You do reimburse them, you reimburse the businesses for the training costs?

Mr. PHEARSON: Yes, an hour a day, 5 days a week.

Mr. HENDERSON: No. 2, on your mobility project, could you just summarize very quickly the basic objective? What is it you are trying to accomplish with this mobility project, and secondly, the basic needs by which you try to accomplish it; because, I did not quite get this.

Mr. PHEARSON: We are working on the assumption that, with the changing needs of the fieldworkers, there are people coming out in the fields who need to relocate because of rural poverty.

Now, we do not want to add to urban poverty, but there are people who want to actually leave the whole area of farmwork and come to the city.

Now, on this assumption, what do we have to do to transplant a family from the rural area to the city, a family who is undereducated, badly in debt, lacking in a skill and job orientation. How would we get them ready to where they will become a productive person in the city?

This is the experiment, the definition of it, and we are learning as we go along about all the various things that are necessary.

One thing that we learned, as I said earlier, is that the grant is insufficient.

The second thing is, basic education is not enough. Further, we need a longer period of time to do these things. Our technique is "support and helpswing," in a one-to-one relationship, in the period before moving, during moving, and after moving; and we operate with a double philosophy.

Some of our field counselors want everything done that can possibly be done before this family actually moves so that they can literally predict a safe, secure move.

There are others of us that will gamble a little bit along the way. If the factors look right, let's move.

But the pressures behind all of this is that if we fail, the migrant family will not become a part of the urban ghetto; he will simply fold up and go back to the farm where he does feel secure.

Mr. **HENDERSON**: This is tied to your OJT and apprenticeship training program also?

Mr. **PHEARSON**: This is right.

Mr. **HENDERSON**: Where does the initiative come for the movement of these people? In other words, do you seek them out and try to prepare them to move, or is it a condition that they take in relationship to the program?

Mr. **PHEARSON**: When we started, we worked with our community organization which was under another phase of MOP, and we simply said to the community organization people in their monthly meetings, "Here is a program, here is a service, and here is an opportunity; and if you have interest in it, let's work together; and if you do not, let's not."

Tony Orona moved on his own. He called us up on a Saturday morning and he said, "I am here," and we moved him.

Leonard Miguel has gone through a vocational class.

Mrs. Anderson, who is appearing here a little later this morning, her husband got a job on his own, so we moved them without the supporting plan.

Mrs. Leford Harry that spoke to you yesterday, they are a prospect; they know of the program; and they have been visited with it; and, I would assume from what she said yesterday, they would have no interest in moving.

But, at least, we have had some relationship to that family.

Mr. **HENDERSON**: I want to be sure that we get the full benefit of this, because here again is the area that it seems to me is going to be critical in terms of our recommendation. I hate to pursue this because of the time, but let me ask just one more question.

You see, this is something, this program that you are dealing with here, this has been suggested many times, at least to my knowledge as much as 8 years ago.

In the recent White House Conference, this was thrown out for debate for several weeks as to whether to make the full-fledged recommendation on relocation allowances and mobility programs.

We were relying upon the experiments under the MDTA, under the migrant programs, and several political questions came into the picture, the whole question of having to uproot families, as you have so helpfully pointed out. You run into these problems.

Now the reason I am asking you is because of the question of the nationwide congressional appropriation which would lend itself to meeting the kinds of needs that the rural people have.

You get into certain sections of the country, such as Mississippi and Alabama, where the political forces would be glad to move Negroes out simply to reduce and minimize their political impact because of the voter registration bill.

I don't know whether you run into that type of thing here or not, because it is dependent upon the program. It has a tremendous impact and the indications are very great, but of course there is the problem of the facilities.

Mr. **PHEARSON**: My judgment at the present moment is that we do not have that particular type of problem.

We would feel some of those pressures if we were tooled up and moving hundreds at the same time that it was the peak of the harvest season; and this is when we would have pressures from farmowners—at the times of the year when the crops are needing to be harvested.

Mr. HENDERSON: Are you familiar with "Reverse Freedom Rides?"

Mr. PHEARSON: No, I don't believe so.

Mr. HENDERSON: Some politicians in Louisiana and Mississippi appropriated some money to move Negroes out of Louisiana and Mississippi into some northern areas so they could understand the problems of Negroes.

Mr. PHEARSON: Oh, is that right?

Mr. HENDERSON: Yes, I am very serious, and this is a very important hearing we are having here today because it presents a basis for us when we get back to Washington and sit down to make some recommendations.

Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN: Dr. Davis, just one question, please.

Mr. LAWRENCE DAVIS: Do you get cooperation from the labor unions in conducting your apprenticeship programs; or, what kind of cooperation do you get from them?

Mr. PHEARSON: We have had only one experience of working with a job trainee, and this experience with that particular labor union was good.

We are not too involved because our people are not candidates for apprenticeship.

I think—my guess would be at this point, that if we could get them at the right age and get them to the point of GED, we would have no problems.

The CHAIRMAN: Reverend Phearson, I think our time is up and we certainly appreciate your appearance and the manner in which you have developed your program here.

Thank you very much for coming in.

Mr. PHEARSON: I want to thank all of you for your time.

The CHAIRMAN: The Commission now will recognize Mr. Alex P. Mercure, State program director, home education livelihood programs, from Albuquerque, N. Mex., and he will speak to us on education of the seasonal agricultural workers.

Mr. MERCURE: Mr. Chairman, with your indulgence, I would like to bring with me a couple of our people who frequently attend meetings with us, because I think that as questions come up, I think they will probably be in a better position to give you a better answer than I am able to give you.

The CHAIRMAN: Maybe we can help you out there in setting up some chairs at the witness table.

Before you start, would you please let us know if you have submitted a copy of your full statement and recommendations?

Mr. MERCURE: I have submitted a copy of my statement. However, I feel that you are all knowledgeable people, and if I can add anything to the presentation this morning with my people here with me, then I think possibly we could enhance the record.

The CHAIRMAN: I was going to suggest that you make available for the verbatim transcript a copy of your presentation, and then that you give us just a very brief summation. Since we do have some copies of your full presentation, by your summarizing as much as possible, that will allow us a little more time for questions.

You may now proceed, Mr. Mercure.

STATEMENT OF ALEX P. MERCURE

Mr. MERCURE: I am Alex P. Mercure and I will speak on the home education livelihood program.

First, the dimension of rural poverty in New Mexico.

Some of the basic problems of rural poverty in New Mexico result from the breakdown of the community economic and social structure. Programs which attempt to solve these problems have generally failed because of their inability to recognize the basic problems and character of the people. People do not even know of many programs that exist. The rural village population does not fit prescribed solutions. Relocation efforts have generally led to failure. Only as a last resort have people shown any desire to move from areas which are their traditional homeland. In the rural villages these people own their houses, land, and have done so for generations. The rural villages offer a social system the people understand and can cope with, whereas the urban or "strange" land cannot offer this security. In rural New Mexico, we have over 60,000 Indians and three times that number of Spanish-speaking Americans. Primarily, these people possess their own folk culture.

Programs to solve the problems of rural poverty must first consider the people, their resources, and their culture. It is unfortunate that, at this time, their problems are the primary focus for program development. It seems to me that the people's strengths must be sought and programs developed from this vantage.

A study of the characteristics of rural poverty reveal the following things:

There are rural villages in New Mexico whose total population with the exception of two or three families make less than $2,000 per family. Sixty percent of the families in Mora County earn less than $3,000 per year. The predominant economic activity in the poorest of the counties is subsistence agriculture.

There are over 120,000 people in the State whose income is partially derived from seasonal and migratory farmwork. Most of these people live in rural villages during the off-season. This is a season of severe stress and hardship for the residents of the villages.

The villages are experiencing a decline in population because of the necessity to find a means of support as well as to find a suitable avenue of growth for those who have the potential. Thus, two types of people are leaving: one, those who possess skills and cannot employ them in the rural economy; and two, those who, without skills, cannot exist in the village—these are the dispossessed. In the first instance the village loses its potential leadership and in the second, urban areas acquire the problems of unskilled people. Considering the high dropout rate and low educational attainment in the rural counties (7.5 grades or less), the net result is the transfer of problems to the urban section of the Southwest. The rural residue is a population which is at best marginal and tends to be, according to "Summary Reports on

New Mexico Resources, 1965," at the unproductive ages—either too young or too old.

Thus, the basic unit of social organization which has been the extended family is in severe state of disorganization from the loss of its middle group through seasonal migration and permanent relocation. Three rural counties are described very briefly to illustrate the condition of poverty in rural New Mexico.

Mora County is located in the north-central part of New Mexico. Economically it is the New Mexico county with the lowest median family income, which is just $2,021 annually. Over 60 percent of the families in Mora County earn less than $3,000. Compounding this problem is the seasonal nature of work and an unemployment figure in 1964 in excess of 20 percent, according to data obtained from the New Mexico Employment Service. In 1965 this estimate was 18 percent. In addition to these problems is the severe educational retardation of these people, who are largely Spanish-American extraction, and their corresponding problem with the English language which in turn compounds the problems of cultural orientation. The total population of Mora County in 1962 was 6,000 of which only 850 or one-seventh, compared to one-fourth in most other counties in the State, were employed and counted as work force. Those employed in agriculture numbered 470, or 55 percent.

Taos County is located in the north-central mountains of New Mexico. The median family income of the people in this county in 1960 Bureau of Census reports was $2,204. Over 60 percent of the families earn less than $3,000. The 1965 data available from the Employment Security Commission of New Mexico estimates unemployment rates in excess of 15 percent for 1964 and 1965. Of the 3,300 employed in 1962, the latest available, 995 were employed in seasonal work, 450 connected to agriculture, 100 construction, and 545 tourism. The Taos County smaller community program indicates that of a sample of 887 surveyed in November 1965, 401 were then seeking full-time work. Of this same sample, 567 were willing to train for employment except that, even with training, employment opportunities are virtually nonexistent. Educational attainment in this county as in most counties in northern New Mexico averages less than eighth grade. Functional illiteracy is a great problem where the native language is not English. In spite of recent development of molybdenum mining and the resultant improvement in the economy in the northern part of the county, the native population has been ill prepared to benefit from this type of development. The people with the greatest need have remained untouched.

According to the United States Census Bureau, the population of Sandoval County is 15,500. The county ranks 23d out of 32 counties in total personal income, and 31st out of 32 counties in total per capita income (1962—$723). According to the Bureau of Business Research of the University of New Mexico, 58.3 percent of the families within Sandoval County earn incomes under $3,000. Sandoval is third, behind Mora and Taos Counties in high percentage of low income families. It is calculated that 77.4 percent of the population are in the category of rural population and 12.7 percent are farmworker migrant citizens. The total employment of Sandoval County in 1964 was 2,348; the unemployment rate during that same period was 13.7 percent. In the early part of 1965, employment stood at 2,052 and the unemployment rate at 12.2 percent. Sandoval is ranked fifth behind Rio Arriba, Mora, Taos, and San Miguel Counties in unemployment rates.

Even in counties which are among the most prosperous, such as Dona Ana, there are large, almost hidden, pockets of poverty. We have worked with people, such as the 11 families (90 people) who were suffering from severe malnutrition as diagnosed by doctors, who did not, at the time discovered, have any food to eat. There are a number of villages in this county, hidden villages, whose people do not have a source of water for their people, which do not have available to them essential health services, residents who often do not know if any public or private agencies are available to assist them. Almost 10,000 earn wages from seasonal work in agriculture.

Throughout rural New Mexico people live in substandard housing because they do not know of any housing programs, people who cannot borrow money from any source, miles from any medical services, these people must travel over often impassable roads for emergency medical help.

Last winter, in Petaca three people died without medical assistance, children were unable to attend school regularly because of the condition of the roads.

The problem of employment is particularly critical because of the high rate of unemployment. The previously cited unemployment figures for Taos are not atypical for the rural population. The frugality of these people perhaps is clearly illustrated in this data, yet the averages have no meaning. In rural villages, welfare clients are better off economically than nonwelfare, but only economically. Welfare people are assured stability of income, essential health services, and caseworker assistance possibly.

The rural residents have only their independence which is on the verge of destruction. Yet, rural life does not have to be a life of slow deterioration but one of self-fulfillment.

Some statements have already been made on rural education. However, additional comment is necessary. For youngsters who have difficulty conceptualizing the subject matter of education because it has no reference to the youngster's life, that is, to his environment, the problem is compounded by its presentation in a language he cannot understand. In addition, theoretically sound principles proceed as if that youngster were typical of a middle-class urban child and did not participate in a unique cultural and social climate. Yet, his background can be used to educate him more adequately.

Because of improper orientation by the helping agencies, most people of rural villages have not been able to use to maximum benefit the resources that they possess. One example: In Taos there are 890 acres of irrigable land; 400 are not being used and 200 are producing a net yield of less than $30 an acre. If assistance were given to these people they could grow crops whose yield approximately would be $150 an acre or over. Just this alone would provide 500 people with an increase in revenue of $84,000 a year. The multiplier effect of this kind of increase could do much to regenerate the economic and social structure of the people of the village.

I plead for an approach to be devised which is sensitive to people's values, culture, and strengths to attack poverty in rural areas.

Gordon Ingraham put it this way:

> A look for instance into the uplands of New Mexico finds a watershed area with readymade communities dying on the slopes for lack of economic sustenance. But they're dying too for other reasons—the inability to cope with the changing world around them, the inability to handle the pressures and stresses of society and as well a reaction to the entire climate of thought which looks upon their simpler cultures as something to either exploit or replace. Certainly a solution here would be to encourage these people to continue within their patterns, however rudimentary, rather than forcing their move to larger cities where misery for themselves and for their new surrounding city is too often the result. Certainly with adequate ties to service centers, to new ideas on economic opportunities which may not approximate our current commercial structure, these small communities might not only survive, but survive to develop a rich kind of life, a life that may project a strong and productive influence on our changing times.

Thank you very much; and, if you have any questions, I will try to answer them for you.

The CHAIRMAN: Alex, I think we will open up for questions here. You have presented us with some information which may very easily trigger some clarifying questions.

I will recognize Mr. Gallegos.

Mr. GALLEGOS: No. 1, New Mexico has experienced massive Federal investments at Los Alamos and at White Sands and in other parts of this State.

There has been some comment made that the Spanish-speaking people of New Mexico were not necessarily recipients of such investments in terms of jobs, in terms of giving on-the-job training opportunities, or in the preparation of the people to take advantage of the new job openings that were developed in those communities; and that equal opportunity is something that never really worked as it should have.

On the other hand, others have said that maybe the training for the people did not have educational attainment, and I would like for you to comment on that.

But, related to that is the factor that investment money, capital funds, were not made available to people in those areas to go into business in those communities, so that it was outside money or in fact those who had capital that could take advantage of it, but the people who owned the land could not benefit by it.

So that, in areas like Taos, which is a beautiful area with a potential for tourism, the people without money would really have to depend on perhaps Federal resources to provide them with that type.

Or, do you feel that there is enough money, that private enterprise would take care of it?

Mr. MERCURE: The one that I will handle first is capital, because we have heard about EDA programs and I am very concerned about this.

It is true, there is not enough capital in these areas. The people who presently own resources, land resources that is, are not going to be able to profit from any development unless resources are made available to them.

Even the experts in New Mexico have indicated that New Mexico is capital starved.

The greatest tourist type of enterprises have been brought in by outside capital. If no approach is made, if no recognition of this fact is taken into consideration, when these plans for the development of this area take place, it will mean that the people of New Mexico who have been there for hundreds of years—fortunately, the Indians have reservations which they cannot sell—they will become dispossessed.

The question of whether training has been made available for jobs, I think yesterday we heard an example of Burnell who took a pretty advanced approach to this problem; and, frankly, I think in a sense that they also were a little over the barrel to some extent. The Indians controlled the land.

Yet, Molybdenum Corporation went in with a big fanfare, with advance notice, plenty of advance notice, to do training of the local population—but no training was set up for them.

The other question is that in rural villages, you train 20 auto mechanics, and what do you have? And the answer is, you have 20 unemployed mechanics.

Governor Cargo recently said 21, because he said that the one who was teaching the other 20 was probably unemployed too.

Mr. GALLEGOS: Finally, I would like your comments on something that I am sure you are familiar with, and that is the border situation in and around Las Cruces, and I would like to know what the impact of the open border is on the agricultural situation in this area with regard to employment.

Mr. MERCURE: With reference to the "green carders"—I think this is what you are talking about—it does have the effect of depressing wages, and there are truckloads of them being brought into Las Cruces. The exact number, however, nobody knows; but, there is this problem.

Mr. GALLEGOS: Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN: All right, I will recognize Mr. Gay.

Mr. GAY: What I am going to say is not so much a question, Mr. Mercure, but a statement that maybe will make you feel a little better.

As an angry young man, I rode out of college 32 years ago and, as a young social worker in rural areas, I started, and you brought it back to where I started, and we have been studying about it for years. We do not know the answers up here, we are all groping and searching; but we are trying, so please keep up the good fight.

Mr. MERCURE: Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: All right, Mr. King.

Mr. KING: I really do not have a question, we are all interested people, but I would like to have you tell us briefly about those three gentlemen there at your table.

Mr. MERCURE: All right, the first one is Manuel Arroyo, sitting next to me on my left, and he is presently engaged in a training program which we call home improvement skills training program, in which we integrate the basic literacy and educational parts with the learning of functional skills which they then may apply to improving their own living conditions, as well as getting them involved in this community life education which is really a group process, group discussions.

On my right is Peter Romero from Cordova, which is just a few miles from the little community of Petaca which was mentioned here just a minute ago, and he has participated in a home improvements training program also along the same general approach.

On the far side over here is Juan Valenzuela from Lake Arthur, a small community south of Roswell, and he has lived there some 30 years, originally from Chihuahua, Mexico, and he is now an American citizen.

Mr. KING: Are all of you of Indian or Mexican extraction?

Mr. MERCURE: Mexican extraction.

Mr. KING: Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: All right, I will recognize Mr. Fischer.

Mr. FISCHER: What kind of jobs do you think you can bring into these small communities?

Mr. MERCURE: Well, it seems to me that a probable solution is to look for a private nonprofit, nongovernmental agency to stimulate the planning processes to develop small shop operations.

For instance, two of these people here have tremendous skills in wood carving, weaving, in all of these areas, and they can produce extremely fine furniture through crafts of this nature which are very marketable.

They produce beautiful woven material.

If a real concerted analysis of the community itself and of its people were taken, every community could have a little small shop that would employ, let us say, 10 people—10 people in a small community of 60 or 70 families can very well wipe out all of the poverty.

Mr. FISCHER: A handicraft operation, is that it?

Mr. MERCURE: Not necessarily. I think there are many things that could be produced.

Right at Los Alamos, which is a famous installation, they are farming out little bits and pieces of things that are small parts for machinery, they are farming these out all the way to California. Nobody has made any attempt to develop these kinds of operations; and yet, within a half-hour's drive of Los Alamos are people living in the worst kind of conditions.

The CHAIRMAN: All right, I will recognize Dr. Davis.

Mr. LAWRENCE DAVIS: Let us rule out prejudice and discrimination. Then, would you consider language problems or culture problems as contributing to the plight of the citizens in, let us say, Los Alamos and those living in similar circumstances?

Mr. MERCURE: Obviously, language has become a problem. However, I think it is a resource. I think it is a pitiful thing that has happened in the American educational system that has developed an educational program and imposed it on a group of people. Consider the possibility of a youngster who comes in to school and does not know English and he is asked to learn something better; and yet, that something better has absolutely no relevance to his life, this aspect has no connection with it at all because of his community. In addition to that, it is compounded by the fact that he is asked to learn the subject matter in a language that he does not understand.

The CHAIRMAN: All right, are there any further questions on the part of the Commission?

Mr. **GALLEGOS**: It is obvious from your statement where you indicate a nonprofit organization, or with a structure of that kind, is needed to stimulate the development of small business, that the Small Business Administration and Economic Development Agency, from the studies they have made, those studies do not touch the people who have those skills and knowledge.

What kind of specific requests and dialogs and pressures have been made on this branch of the Federal Government to provide that kind of service?

Mr. **MERCURE**: Well, we have discussed and discussed, and this is all we have done with the community action people; we have talked about the coordination, cooperation of this type of program with other agencies. That is just about all we have done so far.

The SBA tells us they do not have any money. They are located and centralized at one place in Albuquerque, and these people are not in Albuquerque. These agencies are not going to help these people by sitting in Albuquerque, obviously.

You have to be where the people are. Even the public welfare, which has perhaps been expanded as greatly as any, has a centralized organization because of the lack of cities in some counties. I think we have to look to the kind of approach that would provide service centers in strategic areas of the State where these people live.

The **CHAIRMAN**: We want to thank you for appearing before the Commission, and we also want to thank the other people who came with you. The members of the Commission are really interested in some of the problems and some of the proposed or suggested answers to them that you have brought before us.

We certainly do appreciate the fact that you, as well as many others like you, are giving more than your share in your efforts to try to solve the problems of these people.

So, thank you very much for coming, Mr. Mercure.

Mr. **MERCURE**: Thank you, sir.

The **CHAIRMAN**: Now, the Commission will recognize Dr. Raymond Marshall from the Department of Economics, University of Texas, Austin, Tex., who will speak to us on the subject of on-the-job training.

STATEMENT OF RAYMOND MARSHALL

I am Ray Marshall, professor of economics at the University of Texas. My statement is based on research undertaken for the Office of Manpower Policy, Evaluation, and Research, U.S. Department of Labor. A book grew out of the project, entitled "The Negro and Apprenticeship," and I will speak on the minorities and the skilled trades.

In the summer of 1965, the Department of Economics of the University of Texas entered into a contract with the Office of Manpower, Automation and Training (OMAT, now known as the Office of Manpower Policy, Evaluation, and Research) to undertake a study of Negro participation in apprenticeship programs. The project was completed October 30, 1966.

The project's principal staff were myself, director; Vernon M. Briggs, Jr., assistant professor of economics, University of Texas, associate director; Mrs. Judith Schluter, secretary; and

I. Lamond Godwin and Eugene Solon, interview coordinators. We also used a number of special assistants and consultants for particular purposes.

Although the project director, associate director, and the interview coordinators undertook most of the interviews in all of the 10 cities selected for study, 21 special interviewers were also used. The interview coordinators selected the special interviewers and supervised their activities. Each of the special interviewers was given a "trial run" and his performance judged by the associate director before he was permitted to conduct additional interviews. Our special interviewers were selected mainly on the basis of their interest in the project and their interviewing experience, and came from a variety of backgrounds: graduate students, human relations commission staff members, university professors, high school teachers, social workers, civil rights organizations, and unions.

The immediate objective of our study was to identify and evaluate the approaches and methods which had been used to increase Negro participation in selected apprenticeship programs. Our main ultimate objective was to recommend policies which would make it possible for Negroes to increase their participation in and successful completion of apprenticeship training.

We sought primarily to examine the recent dynamic situations involving the participation of Negroes in apprenticeship programs in 10 major cities with large Negro populations. The 10 cities were selected in such a way as to illustrate a variety of problems and remedial programs as well as to be representative geographically.

Since we were primarily interested in "trouble spots" where civil rights organizations or government agencies were attacking or about to attack the apprenticeship establishment—unions, employers, and specialized government agencies dealing with apprenticeship—we did not attempt to study Negro participation in all apprenticeship programs. We therefore paid less attention to the trowel trades and the carpenters, where Negroes are known to have had little difficulty except for some situations in the South—which we studied in connection with Atlanta and Houston—and concentrated our attention on those programs where there were very few Negroes or where Negroes were having trouble being admitted.

Although we placed heavy reliance on interviews, we also consulted every available published and unpublished documentary source that we could find.

We decided at the outset that revealing answers to our questions would require detailed interviews with all of the categories of people involved in getting Negroes into or keeping them out of apprentice programs, as well as with the Negroes who were at various stages of entry into or exit from those programs. Our interviewees therefore fell into two broad groups: (1) Officials and representatives of: the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training; State apprenticeship agencies; the Bureau of Employment Security; State employment services; local building and construction trades unions; regional and national AFL-CIO bodies; employer and joint industry associations; employer training groups; joint apprenticeship committees; apprenticeship information centers; city government agencies; local human relations commissions; schools; Federal equal employment agencies; and civil rights organizations. (2) Negroes who had applied to apprenticeship programs, had failed to follow through on their applications, had been rejected, were accepted, or who had dropped out. We shall call this category "Negro apprentice participants." In each case we sought the answers to certain specific questions which the particular interviewee was likely to have, but we did not use a structured interview; we placed a premium on letting the interviewee tell his own story.

In the officials and representatives group, we interviewed 121 different individuals. The number of interviews exceeded this figure, however, because some individuals were interviewed more than one time. In addition to the interviews, we held a number of special group meetings, conferences, and seminars with counselors, specialists in testing, scholars, and union and industry officials. There also were interviews with 25 miscellaneous persons, such as Negro and white journeymen and white apprentices, who are not reported in the above total.

We conducted 127 interviews with Negro apprentice participants. Of these, 61 were accepted and remained in apprentice programs, 11 were waiting to enter, 25 were rejectees, 20 failed to complete requirements, and 10 dropped out after being accepted.

As might be expected, no study of two such controversial subjects as Negroes and apprenticeship could be conducted without some difficulties. Our main research problems involved gaining access to information, especially during the early stages of the study. It was particularly difficult to get statistics on the number of Negro apprentices and the names and addresses of the Negroes who were in various stages of entry into or exit from apprenticeship programs. Fortunately, however, there were enough people sympathetic to our purposes that as time went on we were able to acquire almost all of the information we sought that was available; in some cases we were satisfied that information simply had not been collected, in others we collected it ourselves through whatever means we could. We were therefore able to get confidential reports, special studies, memoranda, and verbal statements from people, which, we hope, gave us considerable insight into the inner workings of the apprenticeship problem.

After we got their names and addresses, it sometimes was difficult to arrange interviews with the Negro apprentice participants. Since most of these persons worked, it often was necessary to arrange interviews at night. We therefore often found it difficult to locate our interviewees, especially those who lived deep in the ghettos and who move around a good bit. Some of these youngsters did not have telephones, and interviews therefore had to be arranged through the use of telegrams.

The project also suffered from the time limitations of most of the staff. The interview coordinators were employed full-time for about 5 months, but the director and associate director worked on the project only part-time while carrying on their regular duties at the University of Texas.

We should also emphasize that this study was not designed to be comprehensive in a statistical sense. Although we have interviewed a high proportion of the Negro apprentice participants in our cities, the numbers are too small—because there are few Negroes in most programs, and the Negroes have gotten in too recently—to give a statistically reliable sample about such things as the attitudes of Negro youngsters in general about apprenticeship training and their performance in apprenticeship training and on the job after they complete their training. It would, of course, be useful to compare Negroes and whites on all of these points and to take a large enough sample, with sufficient disaggregation, to give meaningful answers on an industry or craft basis.

In spite of the limitations of our study, and many questions which remain unanswered, we feel that we have gained sufficient understanding of the various facets of this problem to make a meaningful diagnosis of its causes and therefore to recommend remedial programs that have chance to be successful.

Why has so much attention been devoted to Negro participation in apprentice programs?

A number of developments during the 1950's and 1960's focused attention on efforts to get more Negroes into apprenticeship programs. One of the most important of these was the feeling by civil rights leaders that apprenticeship training was an important means of overcoming some of the difficulties that Negroes found themselves in during these years as a result of technological displacement from many of the jobs they had traditionally held. Because of their declining relative labor force participation rates and high unemployment rates during the 1950's and 1960's, the economic position of Negro males and teenagers deteriorated markedly relative to white males. And the situation for many Negroes did not improve as a result of the tight labor market of 1966. For example, between June 1965 and June 1966, the unemployment rate for Negroes 18 and 19 years old increased from 27 percent to 32 percent while the white unemployment rate in that age group declined from 19 percent to 15 percent. It was thought that apprenticeship training, by producing well-rounded craftsmen, would make Negroes less vulnerable to these technological changes.

Another factor focusing attention on efforts to increase the number of Negro apprentices was the virtual absence of Negroes from journeyman and apprentice positions in some of the skilled trades, especially in the construction industry. The 1960 census reported that nonwhites constituted 2.52 percent of all apprentices and that there were only 2,191 nonwhite apprentices in the country; there were only 79 nonwhite electrical apprentices and 62 nonwhite apprentices in the plumbers' and pipefitters' trades. Although it is difficult to believe that these figures are accurate, the fewness of Negro apprentices has been confirmed by many other studies.

For example, studies in California and New York found that Negroes constituted only 1.9 and 2 percent of apprentices, respectively; in New Jersey, Negroes held only about 0.5 percent of apprentice positions. (U.S. Civil Rights Commission, Reports on Apprenticeship, 1964, page 91.)

A survey of 1,000 apprentices in Florida by the Advisory Committee of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights failed to disclose a single Negro. Although the count was only approximate, Maryland civil rights officials reported finding only 20 Negroes among approximately 2,400 apprentices in that State. Of some 50 apprentice programs in Tennessee, only four—bricklayers, carpenters, roofers, and cement finishers—were known to accept Negroes before 1960; in 1961, a breakthrough occurred when one Negro apprentice enrolled in each of the following trades in Oak Ridge: electrician, machinist, sheet metal, and millwright.

A 1964 survey of 989 construction industry contractors, 281 employer associations, and 731 unions by field teams from the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity (PCEEO) found that in 30 southern cities, the number of Negro and total apprenticeship selections were as follows:

	Total	Negroes
Electricians	978	2
Sheet metal workers	441	0
Carpenters	1,120	20
Ironworkers	365	0
Plumbers	792	4
Total	3,696	26

In 4 States and 21 cities outside the South, the selections were:

	Total	Negroes
Electricians	906	14
Sheet metal workers	432	12
Carpenters	3,273	70
Ironworkers	301	4
Plumbers	906	14
Total	5,818	114

The fewness of Negro apprentices was not restricted to the construction trades, however; the 1964 compliance survey of Government contractors by the PCEEO found only 483 Negroes, or 1.3 percent, among 21,500 apprentices.

Probably the largest proportion of Negroes in apprenticeship programs in any city before 1963, were in Washington, D. C., where there were 74 Negroes among 253 apprentices in programs sponsored by individual employers and 142 Negroes of 1,591 apprentices in joint programs; Negroes constituted 8.9 percent of registered and 29.2 percent of individual employer programs. Many of the individual employers were Negro contractors in the nonunion sector of the building trades. The largest concentration of Negroes in Washington's joint programs in 1963 were typographical, 50 Negroes; operating engineers, 18 Negroes; bindery workers, 10 Negroes; cement masons, 10 Negroes; and bricklayers, 15 Negroes. There were significant increases between 1963 and 1965 in Negro apprentices in the Washington carpenters' and bricklayers' programs; in 1965, these programs had 45-50 and 85 Negro apprentices, respectively. The relatively large number of Negroes in the Washington printing trades programs probably is accounted for by printers working at the U.S. Government Printing Office.

Some of the most significant developments between 1963 and 1965 in terms of the number of apprentices were in New York City, where a study by the city Commission on Human Rights found very few Negro apprentices in 1963. However, the Building and Construction Trades Council reported that its affiliates took in 1,140 nonwhite apprentices between 1963 and 1965. The most significant numbers of new nonwhite apprentices were as follows: carpenters, 623; electrical workers, 240; bricklayers, 52; painters, 30; operating engineers, 50; and plumbers, 25. A statistical summary of nonwhites admitted to various building trades unions in New York City between March 1963 and March 1966 shows that, although there have been some breakthroughs in the Sheet Metal Workers and other unions which traditionally have had very few Negro members, except for the very unusual experience of the electricians, most Negro apprentices, even in New York, are concentrated in carpentry and the trowel trades. Similarly, in the building trades programs other than carpentry and the trowel trades, there are very few Negro apprentices in any of the other cities for which we have statistics.

A third factor causing the civil rights movement to concentrate on apprenticeship training was the vigorous oppositions to the acceptance of Negroes into their organizations which some craft unions waged during the 1950's. While the unions' motives for exclusion perhaps were not based entirely on racial considerations, the vigor with which they defended their restrictive policies, and the fact that there were no Negroes in their unions, made it difficult to avoid the racist conclusion. These contests focused the public's attention on a group of exclusionist unions in the building trades, and gave the problem of getting Negroes into building trades unions a symbolic significance which often obscured the quantitative importance to Negroes of the jobs they were likely to get through apprenticeship training. At the same time, however, there can be little question that with the momentum that the apprenticeship question has built up, there are going to be many more Negro apprentices than there ever would have been if the apprenticeship sponsors had accepted Negro apprentices without so much fuss and fury.

Why are there so few Negro apprentices? Although it is fairly easy to make a list of the factors responsible for so few Negroes in apprentice programs, it is much more difficult to assign the proper weights to the factors in the list. One's appraisal obviously is influenced by the vantage point from which he views the problem. The apprenticeship establishment is likely to emphasize the absence of qualified Negro applicants, while the civil rights movement is likely to emphasize discrimination by unions, employers, and apprenticeship agencies. Similarly, various groups are likely to differ in their assessment of the progress that has been made. Civil rights groups are likely to look at the paucity of Negroes in apprenticeship programs and minimize the changes, while the apprenticeship establishment is likely to emphasize the relative progress that has been made in spite of great difficulties.

We have found that this problem is too complex for such simple explanations and that understanding requires attention to specific situations rather than broad generalizations. Nevertheless, we feel that several tentative observations are supported by the regularities that we have observed.

One of the most important problems impeding the increase in the number of Negro apprentices has been the institutionalization of certain racial employment patterns. As is well known, about the only time Negroes were able to practice a wide variety of skilled trades was under slavery when they were protected by the powerful slave-owning interests. After emancipation, Negroes were restricted mainly to agriculture and to certain menial jobs except for a few trades like the trowel crafts in which a large number of slaves had been trained and which could be passed on from generation to generation because of relatively stable job content. Whites monopolized the more highly skilled operations of many of the newer occupations which grew up after slavery and perpetuated their control by monopolizing the more advanced training programs. The only way Negroes have been able to break this monopoly in many cases is through the craft training that has been given in Negro colleges and institutes, mainly in the South. For example, one of our interviewees, the principal Negro plumbing contractor in Cleveland, was trained at Tuskegee Institute in Alabama and moved to Cleveland during the 1930's. He perpetuated the supply of Negroes in Cleveland by forming a plumbing school. Once they acquire sufficient supplies of labor to become a threat to whites—through undercutting wages, breaking strikes, and satisfying the labor needs of employers who might be boycotted by whites—Negro craftsmen sometimes have been able to overcome union resistance, but by that time, many of them have acquired sufficient job control to prefer operating nonunion. As a general rule, however, Negroes have been restricted to certain kinds of residential and repair jobs and therefore have not been given the opportunity to work on a wide variety of projects and acquire the necessary skills to become well-rounded craftsmen. It was only in the crafts which were relatively easy to learn—the trowel trades and carpentry—that Negroes were usually a threat to the whites. We have found, however, that even in some unions in these trades, Negro journeymen have been excluded from unionized jobs.

Once these segregated job patterns became institutionalized, they tended to perpetuate themselves and to change very slowly. In considerable measure this was because after a while little pressure came from Negroes to change the system. The aspirations of Negro youngsters were conditioned by the realities of the situation they faced, and the occasional Negro who attempted to crack the system faced such overwhelming odds that few of them tried it and few of their parents or counselors encouraged them to do so. Moreover, the skilled trades institutionalized their recruitment patterns in such a way as to exclude most Negro youngsters from any opportunity to enter the system.

Of course, although discrimination was and is a serious problem within the apprenticeship establishment, it would be a serious mistake to assume that discrimination was the only motive involved. As is well known, the exclusiveness of some of the craft unions is a method of job control. These trades realize full well that apprenticeship training is important because they can maintain their jobs and wages in the face of nonunion competition and alternative production techniques only if they are more productive than the alternatives available to an employer. This is one of the reasons that the skilled trades unions place so much emphasis on getting qualified applicants. In support of nepotism, craft union members often argue that their sons, because they know the craft and its traditions, are more likely than outsiders to complete their training and to become competent craftsmen.

Of course, the realization of the need for competent craftsmen by union leaders does not mean that the union will recruit only the most competent applicants. Nepotism, for example, obviously produces inefficiency if a relative is less competent than an excluded nonrelative. But the craftsmen have been willing to take this risk in order to get their sons in the trade. Similarly, unless one is prepared to take the untenable position that all Negroes are inferior to all whites, the unions produce incompetence by racial exclusion, and often, as in many southern cities, endanger union conditions by driving competent workers into nonunion sectors.

Several of the business agents we talked with admitted that the unions were defeating their purposes by nepotism and racial exclusion, but professed an inability to change the system. Craft unions tend to be closely controlled by their members; and business agents, therefore, are reluctant to propose measures which are unpopular with their members for fear that they would be voted out of office. Business agents often expressed the feeling that the decline of nepotism and the acceptance of qualified Negroes was very good for their trades, and were glad to be able to blame the government or their international unions for taking the initiative in making these changes.

However, the attacks on the apprenticeship system in recent years often have frozen the apprenticeship establishment into a defensive position that makes it very difficult to promote equal apprenticeship opportunities. In part this defensiveness is natural, but it also stems from what the apprenticeship establishment feels are its critics' unfairness and a lack of understanding of their system. Moreover, the skilled trades unions, especially those in the construction industry, resent being singled out for attack by the civil rights movement for a problem which they consider not to be peculiar to them. Craft unionists also feel that charges of discrimination have been exaggerated, as indicated by the fewness of valid complaints before government antidiscrimination agencies and the paucity of qualified Negro applicants in spite of vigorous drives that have been launched by a variety of agencies in major northern cities.

Craft unionists are particularly resentful of these actions of Government officials, which are based on ignorance of the apprenticeship system and, they contend, are dishonest in the sense that Government officials are attempting to require preferential treatment of Negroes under the guise of affirmative action while disclaiming any intention of requiring preferential treatment. Moreover, the union leaders argue, the Government is attempting to achieve these deeds through blackmail by threatening to withhold or cancel Government contracts. Since these leaders feel that the charges against them are politically inspired and unfair, they naturally are going to resist efforts to get them to change.

Now, concerning the fewness of Negro applicants. Our studies of the 10 major cities make it abundantly clear that special efforts are required to get qualified Negro applicants for many apprenticeship programs and that the fears of the unions and the hopes of the civil rights movement both were unfounded.

The 1964 survey of the construction industry by the President's

Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity found only 38 Negroes in a total of 3,575 known applicants to five apprenticeship programs—electricians, plumbers, sheet metal workers, ironworkers, and carpenters—in the South; there were 11,689 applicants to these programs in the non-South, 370 of whom were Negroes. In a number of cases the number of applicants was not known. Negroes were thus 2.7 percent of the known applicants but only 1.7 percent of the known selectees.

Our interviews with the Negro youngsters and with officials indicate a variety of reasons for the lack of Negro applicants. For one thing, from what we said earlier about the institutionalized patterns of job segregation, it is not surprising that many youngsters who otherwise might be interested in applying for apprenticeship programs do not do so. As one of our Negro interviewees put it, Negro youngsters have learned from long experience that when the white community says "everybody is welcome" they really don't mean Negroes. It therefore takes positive and clear evidence to convince Negro youths, counselors, and parents that the patterns really are broken. It appears that in some cases the demonstrations and other attacks on unions and apprenticeship programs have caused unions and employers to lower their racial barriers, but simultaneously, by publicizing discriminating practices, have strengthened the conviction among Negroes that they cannot get into craft unions; after all, if demonstrations do not succeed in getting people in, what chance does the lone Negro applicant have?

It is apparent, however, that many qualified Negro youngsters neither know about nor aspire to the apprenticeable trades. Negro youngsters who have graduated from high school share the prevailing American bias against manual occupations. Indeed, if anything, Negroes probably aspire to the skilled trades less than whites because they have fewer "role models" among relatives and friends in these trades. The impressions we gained from our interviews on this point confirm the findings of B. A. Turner who studied the occupational choices of 2,012 high school seniors in 14 Negro, 2 white, and 2 integrated schools. (Occupational Choices of High School Seniors in the Space Age, Houston, Texas Southern Univ., 1964.)

Of Turner's respondents, 66.2 percent aspired to professional and managerial positions, 14.1 percent to clerical and sales jobs, and only 3.2 percent to the skilled trades.

These aspirations are reinforced by school and employment counselors who often have a misconception of the opportunities available to the Negro youngster in the skilled trades. Even those who do have realistic comprehensions face opposition from the youngsters' parents who resent having counselors advise their sons to go into manual occupations. Of course, counselors frequently are condemned for their ignorance of apprenticeship programs, but the apprenticeship establishment's secretiveness about its activities has not contributed to enlightenment on this issue.

We have also discovered, however, that many Negro youngsters who learn about apprenticeship training and express an interest in it do not follow through and avail themselves of the opportunity to become apprentices. This has been a common problem in the concerted efforts that have been made to recruit Negro youngsters for apprenticeship programs in Cleveland, Philadelphia, Chicago, and other cities. We interviewed 23 youngsters in this category and studied the experiences of many more by looking at human relations commission files and talking with people involved in recruitment efforts. No clear pattern emerges from our interviews, but the reasons given for failing to take advantage of the opportunity to qualify for these programs were:

Time lapse between submission of application and the beginning of the program was too long	2
Union never notified applicant after he had submitted initial forms	1
Arrived late for written examination—denied permission to take test	2
Could not get off from work on the day that written examination was given	4
Did not want to take pay cut	2
Decided to go to college	1
Was not really interested in the trade to which he applied	3
Was poorly informed as to what apprenticeship is (applied to painters' program because he wanted to be an artist—was disappointed when found out what it was)	1
Forgot admission letter to written test—denied permission to take test	1
Asked friend to submit application while he was away but friend forgot	1
Out of town until after date for submission of application had passed	1
Could not get hold of Human Relations staff official in time to submit application before deadline	2
"Had other things to do" instead of turning in application form	1
Thought fees were unreasonably high	1
Total	23

The Cleveland Community Relations Board contacted 57 youngsters who had been recruited for apprenticeship programs, who applied, but failed to show up for the tests at the appointed time between June 1963 and October 1965, and got the following reasons:

Enrolled in college	13
Could not get off work	9
Military service	9
Found another job	6
Lost interest	6
Lost contact	4
Family obligations occurred	2
Arrived late for test, denied access to test	2
Felt testing center was too crowded	1
No excuse	1
Went fishing that day	1
Had to attend a Reserve meeting on that day	1
Did not obtain money order for test fee, denied access to test	1

Although there have not been enough Negro apprentices to permit definite conclusions, our interviews of 10 Negroes who dropped out of programs after being accepted revealed that 3 of the 10 returned to college, 1 wanted a job with more money and responsibility, 2 were dissatisfied with the instability of their work, 1 did not want to move in order to keep his job, 2 decided that they wanted "something else," and 1 expressed dissatisfaction with outdoor work.

It was interesting to note that none of our interviewees dropped out for any reason associated with racial difficulties. Indeed, very few of our 71 interviewees who got into apprenticeship programs expressed difficulties which were primarily of a racial nature. There were a few situations where Negro apprentices had difficulties with white journeymen, but these were not clearly racial incidents and usually were caused by the hazing tradition in apprenticeship programs. In most cases, the Negro apprentices learned that all apprentices were similarly treated. None of our interviewees expressed any feeling of racial difficulties with their instructors or with fellow apprentices, though some felt that they were discriminated against in employment. In one case our interviewer discovered that a Negro apprentice was being used only on Federal jobs and took action to see that this pattern was broken. In another case, four Negro apprentices felt that their assignments to the board of education were not as desirable as the jobs given other apprentices; the Negro apprentices felt that the board of education got all of the Negro apprentices because it had denied the IBEW local the use of school facilities for its apprentice program because it had no Negro apprentices in it. The one Negro in the Cleveland plumbers' program has been employed only by a Negro contractor.

Although we discovered very little overt racial hostility toward Negro apprentices, a number of them expressed the feeling that, while they were courteously treated, they were not really accepted on an equal basis.

Negroes are also disadvantaged in meeting the qualifications for entry into apprenticeship programs. Most programs require high school, and although Negro educational levels have been improving markedly, the median educational levels of nonwhite males—10.0 years—still lagged 2.2 years behind that of white males; 60 percent of whites but only 37 percent of nonwhites had completed 4 years of high school in 1965. These statistics do not tell the whole story, however, because it is well known that Negro education has been inferior to that of whites in all sections of the country. According to a 1966 report by the U.S. Office of Education, Negroes in northeastern metropolitan areas are 1.6 years behind whites in the 6th grade, 2.4 years behind at grade 9, and 3.3 years behind at grade 12. ("Equality of Educational Opportunity, page 20.) The Negro-white differential is even greater in the South.

In view of these findings, it is not surprising that the average Negro high school graduate should have more trouble than his white counterpart passing even a fair test for entry into an apprenticeship program. Professor Kenneth B. Clark's conclusion concerning employers is equally applicable to apprenticeship programs:

> The fact is that the massive inefficiency of the public schools where the masses of Negroes go, does the discriminating for any prejudiced employer, so that he doesn't have to do it himself.
>
> All he has to do is to maintain even minimum standards of qualifications in such basic subjects as reading or arithmetic, and as things now stand, the vast bulk of the Negro youngsters from the working class, the lower middle class, are unable to meet the minimal standards for employment in other than menial lower status jobs.

"Social and Economic Implications of Integration in the Public Schools," Seminar on Manpower Policy and Program, U. S. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration, Office of Manpower, Automation, and Training, 1964, page 6.)

For whatever reason, it is generally accepted that Negroes do not do as well as whites on written tests. But many observers argue that tests used by the employment service and other testing agencies are culturally biased in the sense that they are standardized on white populations. This criticism is generally conceded by the experts to be valid, and efforts are underway by a variety of agencies, including the Bureau of Employment Security, to develop "culture fair" or "culture free" tests.

One of the experts we consulted in Detroit claims to have developed an unbiased nonverbal test, which is being used by some employers and unions in that city.

Other criticism relates to the questionable use of tests by joint apprenticeship committees (JAC), which usually have developed their own tests. The experts tell us that it is highly unlikely that JAC's or union business agents without the proper training can construct and administer valid tests. Others criticize the weight given to oral interviews in the apprenticeship selection procedures. In some cases Negroes were rejected on oral tests because of such things as having applied to more than one apprentice program, which the sponsors took to indicate that they really were not interested in the particular trade. In other cases Negroes were marked down on the oral because they expressed an interest in a job rather than the particular trade. Because these reasons for rejecting an applicant seem trivial to outsiders, and because they consider it unwise to leave much discretion in the hands of biased apprentice sponsors, some civil rights leaders have advocated that the oral be prohibited or that it be given very small weight in the overall selection process.

However, we are persuaded that it would be unwise to either minimize the oral or to cause apprenticeship sponsors to quit using it. Our evidence suggests that Negroes are likely to have more trouble with so-called objective written tests than with oral interviews. Of our 25 interviewees who were rejected, 14 failed written tests and 6 failed orals after passing written tests. Of the 61 interviewees who were accepted into apprenticeship programs and stayed in, only 11 did so by passing written examinations alone; 22 got in by oral examination alone; 19 passed both written and oral examinations; no examinations of any kind were given in 7 cases, and the examination process is not clear from 2 interviews. The 275 nonwhite electrical apprentices in New York got in without taking any examination other than a brief interview, although IBEW Local 3 now has adopted a formal test to select trainees. Of our 91 interviewees who either took tests or were admitted to unions without tests, only 6 were barred solely because they failed the oral tests and only 11 got in solely by taking written tests. Moreover, we know that in two cases apprenticeship sponsors gave the Negro applicants the written tests in advance of the exam and in another case the Negroes who were tested were permitted to exchange papers; the only Negro to fail this particular test was one who sat by himself.

Our conclusion is that if apprenticeship sponsors want to take in Negroes, they can do so more easily if they have flexible testing procedures than if they have rigid objective tests. By the same token, however, if they want to exclude Negroes, they can use a flexible testing procedure to do so, or they can raise their "objective" standards in such a way as to limit the number of Negroes who can get in. The point is, of course, that motivations are more important than the tests. Although the question of "fair" tests is one about which the experts are in disagreement, there are some safeguards that can minimize the effects of biased tests: They should be given and interpreted by experts; they should be validated in the setting in which they are used; and written tests should not be the sole means of selection.

What has been done to increase the number of Negro apprentices?

The policies to increase Negro participation in apprenticeship programs fall into three broad categories:

(1) General policies to facilitate the increase in Negro apprentices where Negroes want to enter apprentice programs. These policies include better education, full employment, and policies which would increase the total number of apprentices.

(2) Antidiscrimination policies such as: State FEP laws, court action, National Labor Relations Board rulings, Federal and State apprenticeship regulations such as 29 CFR 30, antidiscrimination clauses in Government contracts, the denial of the use of Federal funds under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act, action under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, and measures to encourage voluntary antidiscrimination policies by private organizations.

(3) Special measures to increase the supply of qualified Negro applicants for apprenticeship programs. These measures include: better availability and dissemination of apprenticeship information; better and more realistic counseling by employment services and by high schools; active recruitment and demonstration to Negro youngsters that apprenticeship programs really are open to them; announcements of apprenticeship openings and qualifications in places accessible to the Negro community; and encouragement of preapprenticeship and other remedial programs to make it possible for Negro youngsters to overcome their qualifications deficiencies.

The specific measures that have been taken by governments to accomplish these results include:

(1) The establishment in 1963, of the Advisory Committee on Equal Opportunity in Apprenticeship and Training (ACEOAT) by the Secretary of Labor to bring the ideas of labor, management, government, and minority community representatives to bear on this problem.

(2) The appointment of a special staff within the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training (BAT) to deal with equal opportunity matters (this staff consists of regional equal opportunities consultants, called industrial training advisors; a national training advisor; and a special assistant for equal opportunity to the BAT Administrator) and to maintain liaison with other organizations such as the ACEOAT. The BAT provides administrative and clerical support to the ACEOAT.

(3) The provision by the Manpower Administration for 24 apprenticeship information centers (AIC's) in major cities with large minority populations to collect and disseminate information about apprenticeship training and to maintain cooperative rela-

tionships between the minority communities, labor, management, and government services. The AIC's are jointly administered by the BAT and the BES.

(4) The encouragement and financial support of preapprenticeship programs.

(5) The encouragement and financial support of various private groups like the Workers Defense League in New York, the Urban League-NAACP Manpower Advancement Program (MAP) in Cleveland, the massive cooperative apprenticeship program in Chicago supported jointly by the city of Chicago, labor, management, State agencies, and the Federal Manpower Administration.

The really important question, of course, is how effective are these different kinds of policies and which are most important?

All three of the categories of remedies obviously are necessary. However, our studies lead us to the following observations:

(1) Sanctions have not been especially successful in getting Negroes into apprenticeship programs, though they have perhaps had the effect of creating a climate among apprentice sponsors which is conducive to change, have caused considerable education of all the parties concerned about apprenticeship and civil rights, have caused apprentice standards and programs to become more formalized, and have caused some apprentice sponsors to raise their qualifications. Sanctions and the threat of sanctions have had differential effects on the apprenticeship establishment. As noted earlier, to the extent that the sanctions have been based on misunderstandings of the nature of apprenticeship and its importance to the sponsors, it has strengthened the defensiveness of the apprenticeship establishment.

The sanctions also have generated suspicions about the motives of government and civil rights officials in controlling the apprenticeship system, ignoring qualifications, and requiring preferential treatment. At the same time, however, the sanctions have succeeded in breaking down some of the barriers and strengthening those persons within the apprenticeship establishment who favor equal apprenticeship opportunities. The possibility of sanctions seems always to strengthen "voluntary" compliance programs; the possibility of a hanging tends to concentrate one's thoughts. Although there have been very few occasions in which the sanctions have been used—because there have been relatively few complaints against discrimination in apprenticeship training, and discrimination is difficult to prove—the antidiscrimination agencies have succeeded in making investigations which have clarified the extent of Negro participation in apprenticeship programs and have focused attention on some of the problems involved in increasing the number of Negro apprentices. But the effectiveness of sanctions against the apprenticeship system is limited by a number of considerations, especially: Many employers have weak motives for continuing the system; apprenticeship is largely a private system of training which could operate without government support if it had to; the weakness of the main sanctions (deregistration, requiring that apprentices be paid journeymen rates on government contracts, denial of the use of schools under Title VI, proving discrimination under Title VII and the State and municipal FEP laws, cancellation of government contracts, NLRB directions against violating the National Labor Relations Act) available to government agencies.

In conclusion, although we think sanctions are necessary—and should be imposed against the worst offenders immediately, when it becomes clear that voluntary efforts to gain compliance are not likely to succeed—their main value probably is not in the imposition of penalties, but in encouraging the apprenticeship establishment to get its own house in order. We are persuaded that these voluntary programs can be more important than sanctions because the parties obviously can do things voluntarily that they would not be compelled to do by law in a democratic society. There is a real question, for example, whether antidiscrimination legislation legally can do more than require the parties to stop discriminating; it cannot really cause them to take "affirmative action" of the kind needed to get more Negroes into apprenticeship programs.

(2) Our second observation is that the relative importance of each of the three sets of policies varies with time, place, and circumstances. The general policies to maintain full employment and expand and improve the apprenticeship and general educational systems are always important.

Similarly, perhaps it was necessary to emphasize sanctions during the early period of breaking the barriers to the entry of Negroes into these programs. But while the sanctions should continue to be perfected, there is currently an obvious need to shift the emphasis to the special programs which emphasize increasing the supply of qualified Negro applicants. This is not because we think discrimination is no longer a factor, but because we think the best way to determine the extent to which it is a problem is to get supplies of qualified applicants. If the applicants are forthcoming and they do not get in, then public policy will have to give greater emphasis to such sanctions as policing the qualifications and testing systems. It might be advisable, for example, to provide for national, tripartite review of such matters as qualifications, the length of training periods, and the tests and admissions policies used.

Although we do not feel competent to evaluate the relevance of tests, qualifications, and the length of training, many of our interviewees in the "officials and representatives" categories expressed grave doubts about these matters. The question of journeymen-apprentice ratios is a troublesome one, but the local nature of many construction markets would make it unwise to establish national standards. However, it might be useful to permit tripartite national review of local standards.

With respect to the effectiveness of the special measures to increase the supply of qualified applicants, we think that many of the right things already are being done, but that many of them need to be strengthened. One of the main defects in the flow of Negroes into apprenticeship training has been poor counseling, but this is not entirely the fault of the counselors. Counseling requires information that has not been and still is not available to counselors. There is a special need to get reliable projections on the job opportunities in the various trades. In addition, apprenticeship agencies have not done enough to make realistic information available on the qualifications and opportunities in various trades. There also is a need for better dissemination of information on such matters as the qualifications and time for testing in specific apprenticeship programs.

We are persuaded that the apprenticeship information center idea is a sound one if it is assumed that the objective of public policy is to emphasize apprenticeship training for Negroes, whites, and other minorities. These centers can accomplish this objective much better than they could if they were submerged in another type of employment service, such as the Youth Opportunity Centers. However, our experience suggests that effective AIC's require the following, which they have not always had:

(a) The cooperation of apprenticeship sponsors in making information available concerning apprenticeship programs and informing the centers of the results taken on their referrals to the apprenticeship programs. These officials often do not cooperate in the establishment or operation of these centers because they see them as a threat to their control of apprenticeship selections. It seems reasonable that the centers should be able to check the results of their referrals to see why the applicants were accepted or rejected. If this kind of information cannot be made available on a voluntary basis, action should be taken to require it by law of registered and unregistered programs. This could best be accomplished by the EEOC because BAT has no authority over unregistered programs. However, we would not require apprenticeship sponsors to say exactly how many applicants they would take.

(b) The support and cooperation of State employment service and State and regional apprenticeship agency officials. Some of the difficulties involved in the establishment and effective operation of these agencies stems from opposition or lack of cooperation from these officials.

(c) Competent personnel who enthusiastically support the objectives for which the centers were established. In some cases, such as Chicago, Washington, Baltimore, and Newark, the centers apparently have been relatively successful. But in most of our study cities, the centers have either had great difficulty getting established or have not operated effectively. However, in two areas—New York and San Francisco-Oakland—the centers are not under the BAT-BES arrangement. To really do an effective job, the centers' staffs have to have a great deal of energy, imagination, and flexibility and must by all means have the respect of both the Negro community and the apprenticeship sponsors.

(d) The centers must actively involve all of the parties on their advisory committees. The representatives should ideally be people who are not only dedicated to the objectives for which the centers were established, but should also be truly representative of their groups or organizations. It apparently has been too easy to appoint Negro representatives who were "safe" or union leaders who were more interested in policing the AIC's activities than in seeing to it that they did an effective job. Few of the civil rights leaders or human relations representatives we talked with thought the apprenticeship information centers were doing an effective job. In part this was because they were located in the employment service and sponsored in part by the BAT, and both organizations have bad images in many Negro communities. But the AIC's poor reputation also results from the fact that many civil rights leaders do not understand the centers' functions and expected too much from the centers. They sometimes did not realize that the main function of the centers was to act as information clearing houses for all groups and not to actually see that Negroes were accepted by the JAC's. In other words, many Negro leaders felt that the purpose of the AIC's was to get Negroes into apprenticeship programs, and since they had done this to a significant degree by the time of our study, they have been judged a failure. In other cases the civil rights groups were critical of AIC staff representatives. It obviously is important with these and other programs to avoid building up unrealistic expectations of results.

The industrial training advisors (ITA's) have not been able to function properly in many cases because they lack independence. If the regional director is not sympathetic to the objectives of the program, he can restrict the ITA's activities by limiting his budget. The ITA's too often feel that they are not completely accepted by BAT officials. However, in other cases, such as in Atlanta, for example, the ITA seems to be performing a very important role, because no other agency was actively engaged in equal apprenticeship opportunity activity.

The ITA's obviously could perform a much-needed service within BAT if they had more independence of the regional directors. There can be little question that somebody with the backing of the BAT's Administrator needs to advise the Bureau's field staff on minority group relations and attempt to bridge the wide gap which presently exists between the BAT, the Negro community, and apprenticeship sponsors.

Although some of the preapprenticeship programs have encountered great difficulties, such as the carpenters' program in Washington, others, like the Washington bricklayers' program, have been much more successful. The keys to success, besides the obvious one of effective administration, seem to be careful selection, jobs for the trainees, and cooperation from the unions involved. Many unions naturally are fearful of preapprenticeship programs which they fear will flood the market with poorly trained workers. Some of these fears are based on the feeling that the promoters of preapprenticeship programs have a very unrealistic conception of the number of apprenticeship openings.

Some of the programs which go under the name of preapprenticeship training really are not training for specific apprenticeship openings, but are general remedial programs that can get applicants ready for a variety of training programs. Some of these general programs concentrate primarily on apprenticeship activities, such as the Workers Defense League Program in New York. Other activities, like the Opportunities Industrialization Center in Philadelphia and the NAACP-Urban League Manpower Advancement project in Cleveland, are more general in their orientation, although they have referred some applicants to apprenticeship programs.

The MDTA is one means to give financial support to some of these projects, but by July 1966 it had done relatively little with building trades programs in our 10 survey cities. Indeed, the only MDTA-sponsored projects in our study cities were: Three programs for plumbers and one for sheet metal workers in New York; one sheet metal workers' program in Philadelphia; two ironworkers' programs in Pittsburgh; four bricklayers' programs in Detroit; three bricklayers' and one sheet metal workers' programs in Washington, D.C. A total of 374 white and 182 nonwhite trainees were involved in these programs in July 1966. The nonwhites were distributed as follows: Plumbers, 4; sheet metal workers, 22; bricklayers, 64; carpenters, 13; ironworkers, 17; metal trades, 31; painters, 31.

Whose responsibility is it to overcome the obstacles to equal apprenticeship opportunity?

The obvious answer to this question is: everybody's. But there is a logical division of labor among governmental and private agencies in accomplishing various objectives. Within the government, we feel that the municipalities have a major direct responsibility, especially in construction apprenticeship programs, because the building market is mainly local in scope and because each city has its own reality which municipal governments can understand and deal with more effectively than any other agency if they are prepared to do so. In addition, most Negroes now live in cities.

This is not to argue, however, that other governments do not have a role to play in dealing with this problem. In some cases the city government might be ineffective or the local political situation might produce a governmental paralysis making it necessary for national labor, business, and civil rights organizations and the State or Federal governments to intervene. The kinds of things which it seems most logical for city governments to do include: Maintain communications with the main groups involved and be prepared to collect information and mediate disputes; encourage the establishment of private programs like the Workers Defense League and the Urban League, to recruit and train Negroes and other disadvantaged youngsters; provide information and assistance in getting Federal financial aid for remedial programs; if necessary, be prepared to use the sanctions at the city's disposal to combat discrimination. In some cases, sanctions such as contract cancellation and the denial of school facilities can be more effectively used by municipalities than by the Federal Government.

But the Federal Government obviously also has a major responsibility for all three classes of remedies mentioned earlier. The Federal Government obviously must be primarily responsible for those general measures to maintain full employment, and it can do much to expand the total number of apprentices in order to provide more opportunities for all groups.

But before it takes the policy of expansion, the Federal Government should first clarify its policy in the apprenticeship field. It should particularly seek the answers to such questions as: In the light of overall national manpower policies, should apprenticeship training be expanded? What are the advantages and disadvantages of apprenticeship training as compared with other means of acquiring skills? What can the Federal Government do to see to it that training procedures are more realistic? What measures can be taken to increase the status of the skilled tradesman? To what extent should control of the apprenticeship system be left in private hands and to what extent should such matters as journeymen-apprenticeship ratios, training content, length of training, and testing and selection procedures be regulated? These questions obviously should be answered before policies are adopted to increase the participation of Negroes or other groups in apprenticeship training. In other words, if we are going to expend resources getting Negroes or others into these programs, we must convince ourselves that this is good training and that it should be expanded. If total number of apprentice openings is not increased, far too much emphasis could be devoted to getting Negroes and other youngsters ready for positions which do not exist.

The projected increase in the number of skilled nonwhites between 1965 and 1975 is about 35,000 a year. What proportion of these should be trained through the apprenticeship system? There are about 50,000 apprenticeship openings each year—which is probably an exaggeration when registered and unregistered programs are considered—and the dropout rate is about 50 percent, so about 25,000 craftsmen will enter the labor market through apprenticeship training and many of these apparently go into supervisory and managerial positions. With a great deal of effort, it might be possible to increase the Negro proportion of new apprentices to, say 15 percent; this would provide perhaps 7,500 openings a year and 3,750 graduates a year, unless something is done to reduce the dropout rate. We should also ascertain whether or not there are likely to be many trainable Negro youngsters who will choose to go into the skilled trades after apprenticeship training is explained to them in realistic terms.

We have assumed throughout our study that apprenticeship training is good training, that it should be expanded, and that more Negroes should get into these programs. But these assumptions are too important to be taken for granted without careful investigation.

Besides clarifying the issues and establishing policies through effective research and debate, the Federal Government can do many other things to promote apprenticeship opportunities for Negroes. It can, for example, work to overcome the resentment and defensiveness of the apprenticeship establishment and take measures to strengthen the ITA's, the apprenticeship information centers, and preapprenticeship training programs. In addition—

(1) All antidiscrimination procedures should be removed from the BAT. Enforcement procedures are incompatible with the Bureau's traditional promotional activities, and the BAT's lack of effective sanctions weakens the integrity of the entire operation. At the same time, however, whoever gets the enforcement powers —the EEOC or the OFCC—should work very closely with the BAT because there is a real danger that an ignorance of apprenticeship programs, procedures, and mystiques will cause antidiscrimination authorities to take measures which will damage apprenticeship programs without doing much to increase the number of Negro apprentices.

(2) Encourage organizations like the Workers Defense League, the NAACP-Urban League Manpower Advancement Program in Cleveland, and the concerted Chicago apprenticeship program. These are among the most effective operations we have discovered in increasing Negro participation. The WDL's program seems to be particularly effective because it is based on cooperation with

the unions rather than antagonism, (and publicity-seeking attacks upon them) and because it is undertaking the difficult, but necessary, recruitment job for qualified applicants.

(3) Consider special demonstration programs to overcome many of the handicaps which the disadvantaged youngster faces. One program might be to encourage contractors and the unions—especially the Laborers—to permit youngsters to work around construction projects in the summer so that they will get a better idea of what the various trades are like. Such a program is being considered by the Laborers in Atlanta.

Finally, it should be emphasized that unions, employers, and civil rights groups can do much to promote solutions to this problem. Solutions will not come without conflict, but conflict can be based on a realistic understanding of the situation and the other groups' feelings and interests. Let us next suggest some measures that might be taken by unions and civil rights groups.

Unions

Within the labor movement the main problem of discrimination is at the local level. The AFL-CIO has adopted a strong antidiscrimination policy and, although any program can be improved, the federation seems to be actively doing what it can to implement that policy. The trouble with the AFL-CIO is that it has very limited power over the discriminating locals. And the trouble with the local unions, especially in the building trades, is that their leaders too often are afraid they will be voted out if they adopt nondiscrimination policies. Clearly, therefore, the international unions should bear the greatest responsibility for eradicating discrimination, because within the labor movement only they have sufficient power to accomplish this objective. The excuse of local autonomy should be no more permissible in cases of racial discrimination than it is where locals violate other trade union policies or Federal, State, and local laws, especially now that unions can point to the threat of increasing Government regulation and severe damage to the entire labor movement unless they deal with this problem. It would also seem to be better strategy for the internationals to proceed vigorously—through trusteeships—against the worst offenders than to let discriminating unions damage the whole labor movement.

In addition, some positive measures are as applicable to unions as they are to employers; local unions should, for example, be encouraged to take the following steps:

(1) Make it clear to the Negro community that all qualified applicants will be accepted.

(2) See to it that tests and interview procedures are fair and realistic in terms of the requirements for the trades. Tests might be administered by outside organizations, as is already done in many cases, or outside observers might be present.

(3) Local unions should have printed material which clearly explains the qualifications for membership and apprenticeship training programs. Apprenticeship openings should be announced to various community relations organizations, civil rights organizations, and Negro community leaders. Appeals procedures might be maintained for those who are rejected for membership or apprentice training.

(4) Unions might also maintain channels of communications and effective working relations with Negro leaders, in order to clear up misunderstandings.

(5) Locals should also keep careful records which would be available for inspection to authorized persons.

(6) A really affirmative nondiscrimination program would not passively process Negro applicants who might show up, but would actively search out qualified Negroes for membership as journeymen or apprentices. The unions could, in this way, organize their jurisdictions more effectively and more nearly see to it that they get the kinds of applicants they want rather than taking only those referred by civil rights groups. Unions might also encourage their journeymen members to serve as instructors in various remedial training programs.

(7) Unions should encourage their Negro journeymen and apprentice members to give realistic information on apprenticeship training to civil rights groups. Negro union members can do much to clear up misunderstandings about apprenticeship training and can give Negro youngsters reliable information on the advantages and disadvantages of the skilled trades. Unions might encourage the organization of Negro apprentices and journeymen into organizations like the Lattimer society in IBEW Local 3 in New York. These Negro organizations can do much to promote better understanding of Negroes in and out of unions.

The Civil Rights Movement

Civil rights organizations also have major responsibilities in this area. They can effectively work with the Negro community to produce qualified applicants for apprenticeship openings and improve information and counseling. If Negroes are encouraged to take advantage of the opportunities open to them, they can produce the labor supplies which experience demonstrates do more than anything else to reduce overt acts of discrimination. The experiences of the Workers Defense League (WDL) in New York, and the Trade Union Leadership Council (TULC) in Detroit, and the concerted activities of various groups in Chicago, demonstrate that although recruiting qualified applicants for apprenticeship openings requires considerable effort, a flow of applicants can be found in the Negro community if some organization devotes itself full-time to this problem. Moreover, the WDL's experience also shows that many unions actually are relieved to find a responsible civil rights organization which can supply qualified minorities. However, because of the nature of this problem and the structure of our society, organized active Negroes themselves is a necessary condition to its successful solution. Negro organizations can organize to train qualified craftsmen and bring legal action to see that they get jobs.

The other specific things that civil rights organizations can do include:

(1) Work closely with employers, unions, and FEP agencies to gather information, bring pressure, and supply applicants.

(2) Pay careful attention to facts and analysis in order to present strong cases in adversary situations. Civil rights groups should acquire realistic information on apprenticeship programs

in order to inform Negro youngsters of the advantages and limitations of this form of training.

(3) Take advantage of poverty and manpower programs to provide preapprenticeship and other training opportunities for Negro youngsters.

(4) Wherever possible, civil rights organizations might establish close working relationships—based on cooperation and not hostility or collusion—with various sympathetic representatives of human relations agencies, companies, employers' associations, and unions. Private civil rights agencies can do many things to promote the upgrading of Negro youngsters—that would not be legally permissible or required—and many apprenticeship sponsors could profit from effective alliances with responsible civil rights groups. Many union and employer representatives probably would be willing to form alliances with civil rights groups which understood their problems and needs and gave evidence of wanting to work out problems rather than to issue public attacks against them.

Although our study dealt primarily with the difficulties faced by Negroes in gaining entry into apprenticeship programs, some of the findings probably are relevant for other minorities and the rural poor. These other groups, like the Negro, are inadequately represented in good jobs. Moreover, the reasons for the fewness of minorities in the skilled trades are very similar. Basically, the employment and recruiting patterns of those who control the better jobs have not extended to many minority groups. And minorities have adjusted to these recruiting and employment patterns and too often have not prepared for or sought to enter the skilled trades. It is therefore necessary to adopt programs which will build bridges between good jobs and the excluded groups.

Programs to increase the number of Negro apprentices must include: (1) General policies to facilitate the increase in Negro apprentices—these include better education, full employment, and policies to increase the total number of apprentices; (2) antidiscrimination policies; and (3) special measures to increase the supply of qualified Negro applicants.

Although antidiscrimination policies are important, they are not sufficient to make significant changes in the number of Negro apprentices; these policies focus on discrimination, which is only part of the problem, and are designed to affect the demand for workers and trainees while doing little to influence the supplies of qualified applicants. It is therefore necessary for local agencies to provide programs and strategies based on: Objective appraisals of each locality; working relationships between the apprenticeship establishment and Negro communities; measures to tutor, discipline, and protect Negro youngsters in their efforts to enter and complete these programs. These policies will require the cooperation, and sometimes conflict, between unions, employers, civil rights groups, and government agencies.

I want to be sure that you understand the basis for my remarks. They grow out of a study that was recently completed for the Office of Manpower Policy Evaluation and Research. The study dealt with the efforts in 10 States in the United States to get Negroes into Friendship training programs; so, you do recognize that my remarks have dealt primarily with Friendship and not particularly with the on-the-job training programs.

That completes my remarks, and I will answer any questions you may have at this time, thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Dr. Marshall, and we will open it up for questions now on the part of the Commissioner sitting on my right first.

I will recognize Mr. Stanley.

Mr. STANLEY: Dr. Marshall, I find myself very much in agreement with what you have had to say here, generally speaking, and I am delighted that this study is going to be published. I think there needs to be more information about apprenticeship programs and the status of them throughout the country.

I would be interested in knowing whether or not your study reveals if there is enough variety in the apprenticeship programs. Are they covering enough trades, crafts, and skills for this changing technology?

Mr. MARSHALL: Well, it depends on your standards of comparison.

If you compare our situations to the European situations, there is definitely not. The reason is that—I believe the figure is 85 percent, of all non-college-bound youngsters in Europe go through some form of apprenticeship training. In this country, only about 10 percent of those get into skilled trades with apprenticeship training. We don't know very much about the relative advantages of having served apprenticeship, let us say, as compared to just picking up a trade.

I have got some pretty good ideas that those who just picked it up are at a serious disadvantage, in comparison with those who have acquired well-rounded backgrounds of apprenticeship training.

I think the apprenticeship system, or at least the apprenticeship idea, is adaptable to many more occupations and trades than it is being currently used for; and even those trades have great room for improvement and expansion under the apprenticeship system.

But, part of the difficulty is that the particular unions in skilled trades have used the apprenticeship system as a means of job control; and, therefore, many of them are interested in limiting the number of apprentices—not all of them, but a great deal—but, by trades and by particular situations, this comes about, and therefore what we need to do—and that is one reason I was trying to stress the structuring of the remedies that I have outlined—the first thing we need to do is reassure these people that they are not going to work for the unions, that they are not going to face heavy unemployment because of a job taking in new trainees.

The only way to do that is to maintain a high level of employment in the trades, because most of these skilled tradesmen, particularly, have very high rates of unemployment, which oftentimes outranks the unemployment of minority groups; the unemployment rates among building trades is higher than the unemployment rates among minority groups.

Therefore, you have this depression mentality, I call it, in that you do not know where the next job is coming from. This tends to argue if you will get enough jobs. They do not have, of course, long-term unemployment, say the same as you find in minority groups, for example. But I think if we maintain a high level of employment, which we will I think in this country, and improve the operations in the labor market through manpower programs which we have been trying to perfect, that will reduce this barrier, this form of opposition; and then, it is possible to expand the number of apprenticeships.

I would also say that not many employers are interested in apprenticeship programs. The reason they are not is that through apprenticeship training, you give a person a well-rounded knowledge, and you therefore increase his mobility; and not many employers will accept the highest paid employee in the industry and then help to increase his mobility. On these trainees, it works.

I think this is one of the reasons that Government installations are going to train more employees. They have low wages, lower than the wages in industry, so you could say that the Navy Department gave well-rounded training to its workers, and then those people could go on to private industry.

So, what many employers try to do and what many Government installations at this time want to do is to train people narrowly in specialized skills. The difficulty with that is that they are the most vulnerable to technological change, and this creates our problem of structural unemployment that we get in this country; that is, it is because we do not create well-rounded craftsmen.

I think that is one of the ways to make people more impervious to economic fluctuations, by giving them that training and by making them adaptable to a variety of situations.

You do not do that by narrowly training people for one specific craft.

I am not sure that the European system is necessarily the best one; indeed, I am persuaded that it is not entirely for our situation. But, I am again persuaded that first we need to explore the whole apprenticeship area a lot more than it has been explored in this country, and ask them searching questions about—is apprenticeship training good training, or is it something that I have assumed. I think that just by way of observation. But these things need to be better studied. And we also need to study to see if it is adaptable, let us say, to the field of agriculture; and if so, to what extent; and what kind of changes need to be made in our present program to make it more adaptable.

Mr. STANLEY: My second question dealt with the quality of the training; because, you said that you just assumed that it was good training. Did your study not encompass this?

Mr. MARSHALL: Well, I know I can answer that, even though I cannot put numbers on it. I can answer it in a general sort of way.

First, the quality of apprenticeship training varies a great deal from trade to trade.

Some trades, like the plumbers and the electricians, have very, very good programs. Other programs are very casual in giving adequate attention to the academic part of the training or to training related to the apprenticeship. I think they ought to give more attention to that, even though most apprentices feel that this is the least important part of their program, probably because of the way it has been done. And it has been the least valuable part; probably because it suffers from the same inadequacies as does much vocational training in this country. And this is one thing we found in our study, as you would expect, that jobs which are served by vocational training are trained in vocational schools. We have some advantage in getting people trained in vocational schools in apprenticeship programs. We decide that they were at a decided disadvantage in getting into the program, they were much less likely in most of our cities to pass a test for entering into these programs than those who had gone through a nonvocational program or an academic program, partly because they were inadequately prepared in mathematics, languages, and sciences.

Mr. STANLEY: Finally, I am sure you know, as anyone does that works in this field, that registered programs are tripartite programs, in a sense—labor-management-government, as an example—make an ideal kind of situation, I think, to produce skilled craftsmen. And I agree that such associations as the electrical workers probably have the most highly sophisticated program in the country, and their standards are also higher, which mitigates against the apprenticeship program getting the kind of people we are concerned with here into their programs, because of education, social imbalance, and what have you.

The other factors that you mentioned, plus the political considerations, all of these things almost take them out of the picture.

I spent a great deal of time in Hawaii recently. The electrical workers' union, for example, is controlled by the Japanese; they have a high percentage of Japanese members.

Most electrical workers there are of Japanese descent, and that is the same way it is in this country where these highly skilled trades are controlled by Anglos, and you will find that most of the plumbers and electricians are of that descent.

But, I think there is a lesson to be learned for all of us in training—and this is the point that I want to make—that this partnership or tripartite operation, that this has proved that it can produce a higher level of skilled crafsmen than any other method that we have been able to get up to this time, at least that is my conclusion, and I wonder if you agree with that; and furthermore, if we should pursue this in other areas where we have EDA, OJT, things like that going on now. I happen to be administering an OJT program where it is labor-management-government, and I think it is successful.

Mr. MARSHALL: Well, on your first point about standards, I think that of course is a very important point.

However, that is the reason that I outlined this third category of remedies; that is, programs to increase the supply and creation of agencies in the minority community; I think whatever it is, the same rule applies.

I have been very much impressed by the ability of a dedicated group of young teachers or tutors to take youngsters from deprived backgrounds in New York City and work with them in this Defense League Program. These youngsters are people who would come under your category of probably untrainable, and these teachers then get them ready for the most sophisticated program in New York City; for instance, the sheet metal workers, the electrical workers, plumbers, pipefitters, and also in other programs.

Now, the way they did it—and of course, as you know, one of the most deplorable things about our training programs in this country is the inadequate education of the youngsters who get those; and, I am sure that it applies even more, according to the United States Office of Education, to youngsters in rural areas.

They found that in the northeastern communities—this 1966 report of the U.S. Office of Education entitled "The Equality of Educational Opportunity," found that in the major northeastern cities like New York, at the time of graduation from high school, the Negro youngster is 3.3 years behind the white youngster. The longer he stayed in school, the farther behind he gets.

Now, this group has taken these fellows who were technically ninth graders, and they have competed successfully against whites who have had college training, in taking tests to enter the electrical, sheet metal workers, and these various other programs.

The way they did it is that they have made education meaningful to them, they have reached them, and it motivated them to get ready for this, and they have been able to do it simply because of this specialized program.

You see, they said to them, "You go through this program and you are going to get a job; therefore, learn this and you can get in there."

They relate this to what these youngsters already know; and they also give them some pride in their race or position or whatever it is. They say to them, "It is up to you to demonstrate that you can do this."

Once you introduce that element into it, I think you can get this motivation to learn, if you create that attitude. You see, these people say to themselves, "Well, they say we cannot learn. We will just show them."

This gives the strong motivation to do it and this has been a very successful program. It has been so successful in fact that the sheet metal workers in New York City presently have a lawsuit against the Defense League because too many of their youngsters passed that test.

Mr. STANLEY: Thank you, Dr. Marshall.

The CHAIRMAN: Now a question by Dr. Henderson.

Mr. HENDERSON: Let me preface my remarks by saying that I am very familiar with Dr. Marshall's study, and we are old friends, and I am asking some questions really to put some things in the hopper in order to get some reactions here.

Also, I should say that my specialty is research, in addition to being an economist. So, let me just throw two or three things out here.

First, I think on this question of discrimination, racially, ethnically, and otherwise, we here in the Southwest have the Spanish-speaking Spanish-American problem, and the Indian problem, and so forth and so on; and other sections of the country have Negro problems and white problems.

I think that we do have to face the fact that in the apprenticeships, as Dr. Marshall has pointed out, certainly racial discrimination has been and continues to be a dominant factor in determining the extent of discrimination.

One of the things that strikes me though is this whole credential method, the whole qualifications method. Most of the apprentices that we have in this country—the programs do not require a high degree of qualification, that is academic qualification, in order to qualify. But these things are raised and lowered according to the racial groups that are involved.

Now, am I correct in that observation?

Mr. **Marshall**: Well, let me say in the first place that we did not really feel competent to make an evaluation of that question of whether or not the qualifications were valid.

Now, I do think that somebody has to do it; but it has to be somebody who understands a lot more about the great variety of trades than we did.

I think also, and I have some evidence, that there is no doubt but that many of these programs raised their requirements and qualifications in response to pressures from the civil rights movement. They have admitted this to me privately on more than one occasion, that that was part and parcel of what they were doing, and I think this whole question needs some careful examination.

However, I am impressed by the attitudes of some of the teachers who have been involved, the workers who are involved in these programs, to try to meet these qualifications; and their argument is that if they are uniformly administered, we can get people ready to go take them; if any whites can get in, we can get some Negroes into them.

Not many people are going to get in anyway; and, therefore, we can get some people in.

Mr. **Henderson**: Let me interrupt you.

Are you in a position to make an observation on whether the credentials required under the apprenticeship training programs are unrealistic——

Mr. **Marshall** (interrupting): Oh, I think they are, because——

Mr. **Henderson** (continuing):—and, if we really want to expand and open opportunities for minority groups across the board; and, if so, one of the things we have to do, particularly in terms of a registered program, is to face the reality or to face the fact that credentials and requirements in many instances are unrealistic, and that they are not necessary, and that they could be lowered, and thereby expand opportunities for these people.

Mr. **Marshall**: Well, there is no question about it. In fact, we found a correlation between the so-called extent of the objective standards required and whether or not Negroes got in. For carpenters, for example, there were very low requirements, and a lot of Negroes get into this.

As to the electricians and plumbers and sheet metal workers, they apply very high standards.

Now, in defense of this system of tripartite determination of the standards, let me say that the whole question of qualifications is very important, of course, to the unions, employees, and employers involved.

Now, business agents for example have told me that most of their trouble comes from incompetence, and they agree that nepotism follows from that. The argument goes something like this: If you are going to support a $6-an-hour wage rate, you have got to have people who are productive and who can produce $6 an hour in terms of output, or the employer will be tempted to go nonunion or at least use substitutes in order to accomplish this.

Now, this type of thing is one of the ways in which these community organizations that I am talking about have been able to form an effective relationship with the labor movement; and that is, they say, "Okay, if you want qualifications, we will send you qualified people," and the apprenticeship people say, "Well, these are the kind of people we can work with."

They do send qualified people.

Mr. HENDERSON: Do you see much of a role for apprenticeship-type programs in combating poverty?

Mr. MARSHALL: Sure.

Mr. HENDERSON: For example, you have cited, if I recall correctly, that approximately 2,500 nonwhites graduated——

Mr. MARSHALL (interrupting): Well, no, we don't even come close to that. It is less than half of that now.

Mr. HENDERSON: But, you would see a role for expanded apprenticeship programs, assuming we could get around the language problem; assuming we could get around racial discrimination problems; assuming we could get around collusion between labor and management, which is a very important factor in this whole question of open opportunities, there is this problem of collusion. Then you feel that this kind of training would be important in expanding opportunities and playing a very important role in combating poverty?

Mr. MARSHALL: Yes, I think so. The reason I do think so, of course, is that bridging a part of the gap is a very important point; and, mainly, we would be doing this with the youngsters.

This, of course, is going to be one of our denominators—to look at and know what has happened to the age structure of minority populations in the work force in the future.

That is one of the reasons, of course, that you have had the phenomena of the unemployment rates among minority teenagers continuing to increase in the entire labor market.

Mr. HENDERSON: How would you place, in terms of the OJT program and the apprenticeship program, how would you place the two in terms of their role?

Mr. MARSHALL: Well, I think that OJT is very important, but it does not train these people for the kinds of jobs that the apprenticeship program trains for. The person who serves an apprenticeship is more likely to be a craftsman, a highly skilled worker.

In some of these programs, in two or three years' time, over half of all apprentices have gone into management, they have become supervisors or foremen or contractors themselves. This is one avenue of advancement in the contractor positions. You cannot get this from the OJT program.

Mr. HENDERSON: Let me put it another way.

Really, these are two different kinds of operations and I realize that the outcomes, perhaps they differ in terms of mobility and actual job occupation and earnings; but, on the other hand, we are here trying to meet the problems of people with relatively low skills, but with potential.

Mr. MARSHALL: Yes.

Mr. HENDERSON: Now, I am really trying to get at the question of the role, the contrasting roles that are played.

Now, I am thinking primarily of not the craftsmen so much as the inner-plant type of operations.

Mr. MARSHALL: Well, no doubt that quantitatively OJT is much more important than apprenticeship. I think qualitatively, the apprenticeship program is more important than OJT.

Of course, apprenticeship is OJT.

Mr. **HENDERSON**: I understand that, but we do have a difference in the approach.

Mr. **MARSHALL**: Yes, the difference is, of course, the extent to which you train for identifiable crafts through the apprenticeship program as contrasted with OJT, where you train not for a craft but for a job.

Mr. **HENDERSON**: I just have one more thing, Mr. Chairman, and I will be through.

Are you acquainted with the attempt, I think within the last 24 months—I may be in error on this—to establish apprenticeship information centers?

Could you give us any—I know something about them—but, I am just curious as to whether you have made any evaluation of this as to an approach to try to expand the flow of persons from low income groups into apprenticeship programs or similar type programs?

Mr. **MARSHALL**: Yes.

Mr. **HENDERSON**: These centers are resisted by both labor unions and by management; and I wanted to make that clear.

Mr. **MARSHALL**: Yes, and of course also by some civil rights people.

Mr. **HENDERSON**: Yes, but I believe that is only because they thought there might be something better.

Mr. **MARSHALL**: Yes, they felt that it is not completely the answer, at least that is what I have been told.

But the idea is based on sound principle; and that is, that very few people know enough about apprenticeship training, how to get in, when, what the requirements are, and all of these things.

The difficulty with the AIC (Apprenticeship Information Center) we found is that because they have not had—well, apart from many reasons why they have not been effective—one reason is that they have to operate through the State agencies, in cooperation with the State Employment Service, and this limits their effectiveness.

One of the most effective, in Washington, D.C., avoids that problem.

Another difficulty they have, of course, is—I don't know whether it is intentional or unintentional—the people who run these centers frequently don't know what they are doing; and I think sometimes they were put there simply because those that oppose the expanding of apprenticeship training knew that they would not be able to figure out what to do anyway, so therefore they would not have to worry about them.

The other difficulty is that we are here talking about building bridges; and, in order to build bridges, you have to have continuity between the organization you are talking about and the jobs you are talking about, and the people you are talking about.

The apprenticeship information center was discontinuous; that is, they were concerned about getting people in, and they rarely checked to see what happened to them once they referred them out.

They did not have the cooperation of the apprenticeship people; and, therefore, they had inadequate information about where to send people and what happened to them once they got there.

I would say that an organization, in order for this to be a successful operation, it should be a private organization supported by all kinds of funds so that you would not be dependent on Government funds and the uncertainties of whether you were going to be refunded, and they could perform this function much better.

Take New York State; New York State has the apprenticeship information center, but many of the people in the apprenticeship system inquired of us while we were doing our work if it was still in operation. They did not know about it.

Mr. HENDERSON: Why do labor unions and management resist such an innovation that may increase the flow of applicants, for example, which is a considerable part of the problem?

Mr. MARSHALL: I think one of the reasons they resist it is because it is Government.

Mr. HENDERSON: I don't believe that.

Mr. MARSHALL: Well, I do.

Mr. HENDERSON: Do you really believe that?

Mr. MARSHALL: Yes, and their argument goes something like this:

The apprenticeship system is something we control; and we want to control the selection of candidates; and we want to control the requirements for the training; and we feel that the apprenticeship information center is simply to kindle coals under the tinder; that is, in preparation to move in and take us over.

Mr. HENDERSON: Oh, I thought you were looking at it from another point of view. Mr. Phearson, here this morning, was talking about mobility and he was tying that in with other things. Now, I am simply trying to pour all of this together. You see, part of his problem was a matter of apprenticeship information.

Mr. MARSHALL: Well, of course what I am saying—what I was saying there is that the apprenticeship system has its own kind of mystique; it is a tightly controlled system; and it throws out resistancies to outsiders. And it is a very hard nut to crack if you have followed their efforts to do it.

One of the things that many of these people seem to resent is Government interference with that system.

You see, even though we term it a tripartite system, the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training really has very little to do with the apprenticeship training system. They have registered the program. It is a purely promotional, voluntary-type of thing and they have very little power over the program.

Now, the only thing they can do is deregister the program, and that means very little. Many of them will just say, "All right, go ahead and deregister, and then see what you do."

I think it is important to keep the Government in there as an interested advisory and standard-setting organization, from that position.

Mr. HENDERSON: Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Doctor, not only for your presentation, but for the very exhaustive study that you have made. We are very much interested in your study and the areas that you have covered.

Thank you again, sir.

Mr. MARSHALL: Thank you. I enjoyed being here.

The CHAIRMAN: We will now recognize Frank Mares, Jr., from Taos, N. Mex.

Frank, are you providing us with a copy of your presentation which you are going to make here today?

Mr. MARES: Yes, I have; or, at least I will furnish several copies a little later. I have furnished two, I think.

The CHAIRMAN: All right, fine.

Now, you may proceed, Mr. Mares.

STATEMENT OF FRANK J. MARES

Mr. MARES: I am Frank J. Mares, fieldworker, Taos County Community Action Program, P.O. Box 1517, Taos, N. Mex.

In an effort to obtain a better insight into the problems of the poor and disengaged people of this region, I traveled better than 1,000 miles interviewing people in rural villages. A recorded tape of these interviews is available. A summation of impressions and comments of these interviews is contained in this paper.

The area that this statement intends to cover is a portion in the State of New Mexico that can best be described as an enclave of traditional Spanish-speaking people. Included in this rural area are the counties of Rio Arriba, Mora, San Miguel, Guadalupe, Colfax, and Taos. An agrarian region in years past, it would be accurate to say that this region has been in a depressed state since the early thirties. There have been drastic changes in the overall social and economic patterns in the region during this time and the most negative results have been inherited by the native population, consisting of Indians and Spanish-speaking people.

It would be impossible to consolidate in a paper of this nature the numerous problems encountered in this region. It suffices to say that for those people caught in the spiral of economic needs, social disorganization, and cultural transition, the idea of being citizens of one of the most prosperous countries in the world is too foreign for them to believe.

This paper will therefore attempt to deal with the following topics:

No. 1. Public programs that have failed to relieve the plight of those people.

No. 2. Public programs that have done some good.

No. 3. Problems of rural migrations to urban areas.

Underlying the failure of most public programs that have operated in this region is the fact that problems concerning the human dissension factor have never been incorporated in the planning for the region. This became a critical mistake when one considers that the value systems involved are not compatible.

On one hand we have the native population functioning through a subjective, traditional method. This is no match for the rational-legal approach followed by the dominant system. In analyzing the numerous programs that would help these rural people, it is immediately evident that the odds are stacked in favor of those individuals or enterprising businesses that are able to understand an objective, rational, legal system. In a way, public programs sponsored by the government could well be labeled "free enterprise for the poor and socialism for the rich." That is, in order for someone to take advantage of public programs, you need to have the economic means.

Following are comments on examples that fail to meet the needs of the people:

First, the Manpower Training and Development Act.

Individuals need to have a high school diploma or the equivalent. Also, a reasonable degree of assurance of a job within the area served by the employment office is needed before an individual can be accepted for training. In an economically depressed area, jobs are few or nonexisting.

Secondly, the Headstart program.

A good program for urban or microurban areas. In rural areas it is difficult enough to attempt to get older kids to school because of transportation. Trying to send 5-year-olds is next to impossible.

Third, the damaging programs that are affecting the region today are those that are attempting to make a recreational area of this region. This has resulted in legislation that is of benefit, again, only to the entrepreneur. Examples of these are water rights legislation, grazing rights practiced by the Forest Service, and economic development programs. All these programs are geared to force the people off the land, and hence migration to urban areas is inevitable.

Fourth, social service agencies like the welfare department have done more damage by speeding up displacement than possibly any other Federal or State service. This comes about through the practice of forcing the clients to dispose of any land that could be useful to them in terms of the possibility of these land parcels remaining potential assets. The time-tried maxim of "things are going to get worse before they get better" seems to be a major tenet of current welfare practices.

Fifth, the education systems of the region have operated mostly on concepts and philosophies that are in direct conflict with the values of the people living in the region. Because of this rigidity in the current educative practices, little progress has been made in the direction of keeping children in school. Those that resist the methods of instruction used become alienated and leave school without a real sense of direction. More emphasis should be placed on accepting the value of the culture plurality.

One of the most striking paradoxes found in all government programs is the extreme concern and preoccupation with consolidation and centralization of programs. The small rural communities are easy prey for what is becoming increasingly considered as the greatest threat to the rural way of life, and this is known as the numbers game. The competition for the governmental dollar with the urban programers leaves the rural communities far back in the field. Opposed to this is the general concept of the Economic Opportunity Act, which calls for the decentralization of programs.

This results in an immediate clash or conflict situation, preventing whatever use could have been made of other agency resources.

In looking at what the community action program is asking for, it is obvious that involvement of individuals is a primary requirement. Yet, how are these people to participate in making decisions that affect their lives? Take, for example, the hold that village stores have on the lives of these people because of credit. Again, how well do we understand how local politicians use welfare assistance to control the voting patterns? It is also evident that the judicial practices found in some judicial districts is one of direct intimidation to prevent people from expressing their wants. This usually comes about through the practice of filing trumped up charges and never prosecuting but using this as the club to keep people in line.

If these government programs are to be successful in this region of northern New Mexico, it will be necessary for program planners to use a more comprehensive approach. Just as man does not live by bread alone, problems of a social nature cannot be solved simply by a theory of economic determinism.

The problems of rural migrations to urban centers will continue to create problems in both places. For one thing, rural people moving into an urban center will become even more disengaged from participating in community living. Others, not being able to cope with urban life, will return to the villages. Here they will float around hoping to make it from day to day. If the dominant system fails to accept as a moral responsibility the need to assist this people, then at the most, these people will continue to be pawns in the hands of destiny. Indeed, recreation will lead to exploitation and exploitation to elimination.

In my work in the county, in the rural areas, in the pockets where poverty is very evident, people feel that they now have an agency to which they can give expression.

Even yesterday while listening here to the comments of others who came up here like I am here today, a man 73 years old from an Indian pueblo told us yesterday that in order for these programs to become successful that they needed better lines of communication between BIA and the people. Therefore, it made it evident to him that these established agencies have not been giving the people the voice that they should have in planning their own programs, in expressing their needs.

One of the areas that I feel needs the most attention is where people are in great need of legal aid, because they do not understand the programs that are being planned by government. They understand the things that they want to do; but, they do not understand the programs that the government is planning for them.

The CHAIRMAN: May I interrupt you at this point?

Mr. MARES: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, you mentioned there a program which I believe has drawn quite a bit of interest. I know that in the part of the State that I come from, the State of Texas, I know there is a great deal of interest in the legal aid aspects.

Has the local bar association or the State bar association taken a stand where they would like to have this kind of a service provided to the people; or, do you know?

Mr. MARES: Legal aid is still in the planning stages; and we are trying to get around this through our credit union.

The credit union is one of the programs that is being brought to the people and has had direct and immediate results. What I want to say is that it brings immediate relief to the people for whom it is intended.

They benefit from the credit union immediately. Yet, a credit union without the aid to function at least for its first 2 years, this would make the waiting period, that the people would have to wait before getting direct benefits, just that much longer.

In reference to legal aid, I think that even people that are not covered in these programs of dire need cannot afford legal counsel. Besides, the more depressed people are even afraid to use legal counsel because of the high cost of such. People will have to be educated to use the services if made available.

One of the big failures, I think, of an established agency such as the welfare department is that the people again have the problem of getting many miles to reach the service place that is supposed to be theirs.

The CHAIRMAN: Could you tell us what the population at Taos is?

Mr. MARES: Taos is 18,000; that is, Taos County is 18,000.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, I am interested with reference to the legal aid aspect of the matters you have explained to the Commission here, and I know it is very important, and I know from what you tell the Commission that these people very badly need it.

But, unless the community there moves together to obtain some leadership on the part of the bar association along these lines, sort of an association between members of the bar and the members of the community, or a sort of a partnership agreement where some criteria will be used for the people who cannot apply for this particular legal aid; in other words, you must get the people and the local bar association together, and then the legal aid can become a part of the local community action program. It can be very important to any community.

Mr. MARES: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, whether or not the bar association is ready to take steps in that direction, I do not know. That is why my question was made to you; and that is, has it given any leadership along those lines?

Mr. MARES: Not as of yet. But, it is intended though to do that. We do intend to take that step because, more and more, the people are asking for us to try to get a legal aid program for them.

In the welfare program for instance, the people have to come a long way to get these services. The welfare worker does not get to the people; and, I think it would be easier for the welfare worker to get to the people. They have to come many, many miles.

The social security people do not get out there, and it is hard for the people to get to them. You see, they send a man from Taos County to service the entire county, and the center of service is Taos. People have to come anywhere from 50 to 60 miles. When they get into town, they find that they have sent a representative that knows nothing in Spanish. They can't get hold of an interpreter. This man only has 2 hours to work with these people.

It would be easier to get that person 1 day a week to the different communities in the outlying district.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, you made one comment there which is a comment we have tried to get across in Washington with reference to having Spanish-speaking employees of the different governmental agencies to be assigned in the areas where this would be of help to the people. But they have been assigned up north; and the non-Spanish-speaking employees then have been assigned to the south where it will take an interpreter for them to get in touch or in contact with the people that are trying to get the services.

That comment was well justified and there have been many such complaints made and they have been assigned to the people who can and are in a position to take some action on them.

Now, are there any questions?

Mr. LAWRENCE DAVIS: I was especially concerned about your comment about the Headstart program.

In view of the fact that most persons have testified that the Headstart program was a fine thing, one of the finest things that has come out of the Economic Opportunities program, I think you are saying that it is impractical in the rural areas.

Assuming that it was more practical, that it would have value for the children, is there anything that you would like to suggest in the way of filling this need of rural children, if Headstart is impractical?

Mr. MARES: Yes, it is impractical for this reason. We have areas in our rural district there where children 5 years old go a distance of 40 miles, 80 miles a day, and even then it is not practical for these children to be moved such long distances as this.

These people cannot make use of a Headstart program.

There have been instances where the term of the program was only utilized for about 8 weeks because of bad roads and weather conditions, and the long distances involved in transporting these children makes it impossible.

Mr. LAWRENCE DAVIS: What is a way of meeting this problem? Is it the building of roads or putting the centers near the children and having more of them, thus having fewer children in each center? What is the answer to solving the problem that you have?

Mr. MARES: Yes, by having the centers right in these communities where they could be utilized, so that the nearby communities could transport these children say for only 10 miles; then they would be serving this area.

But in applying for the funds for community centers, they tell us that there are no funds. They say first that the community has to come up with the property; then they have to put up a certain percent of this and that. Now, if we had a central bank where the people could apply instead of applying through the different agencies and having to go through the maze of redtape, this service would trickle down to the people, to the people that really need it.

Instead, the monies are used for administration. For administration of what? This is for offices for people to come to and they won't even have the people there to take care of their needs.

Even when they have traveled long distances to come to the central agency at great expense to them, there is nobody there to take care of them.

The FHA does not have a bilingual; yet they are operating in an area where most of the people are Spanish. They do not understand the people, they do not have or they can't make use of these agencies. It is good to have these agencies if the people can get to the source of the money.

The CHAIRMAN: That is true. We appreciate your remarks and they are incorporated in the record and we appreciate your being here very much. Was there anything about the gentleman with you that you would like to tell the members of the Commission about?

Could we get his name first?

Mr. MARES: Yes, this is Frank Valdez and he works out of the University of New Mexico, and I am sure that if there are any questions that anyone here would like to ask of him, I know he would be very happy to answer them.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions by any member of the Commission? (No response.)

Then, thank you both for appearing here before us today.

Mr. MARES: I want to thank the Commission for giving me this opportunity to come and express my views here to you.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

The Commission now will recognize Raymond L. Johnson, the executive director of the Los Angeles Area Economic Development Agency, Inc., from Los Angeles, Calif., and he will talk to us about migration of rural Mexican Americans to the city.

Now, I hope that you have a prepared record of your presentation here so that it all may get into the record, and then you can perhaps just summarize for us, and in that way perhaps we can have some time for questions.

Mr. JOHNSON: Yes, I do have a prepared statement.

The CHAIRMAN: Very well, you may proceed, Mr. Johnson.

STATEMENT OF RAYMOND L. JOHNSON

Mr. JOHNSON: I am Raymond L. Johnson, attorney, executive director of the Los Angeles Area Economic Development Agency, 312 West 5th Street, Suite 601, Los Angeles, Calif.

I will speak on "Urban Planning for Rural In-Migrants."

The executive director of this program has indicated to me in a prior discussion that I could make a significant contribution to the program if I would speak on the subject of the effect of rural inmigration into the Los Angeles, Calif., area. Therefore, I shall attempt to confine my remarks to this topic.

As you probably know, California has a tremendous influx of immigrants into the State each year. They arrive by all modes of transportation: planes, buses, cars, walking, motorcycle, and so forth. Statistics show that the growth rate of the population of the State of California is twice that of the national average. During the year of 1967 it's predicted that 557,000 new people will be added to the census of the State of California due to immigration.

Many of these new immigrants to the State come from the rural sections of our country. They bring with them their own unique and built-in mores, traditions, ethnic and racial associations, handicaps, and attributes.

We who are in the business of urban planning must cope with all of these issues. Where we fail to cope with these issues or cope with them inadequately, and come up with insufficient solutions, we are faced with traumatic evidence of our ineptness by a situation such as the Los Angeles riots of August 1965.

The trend and tendency has been for the newly arrived immigrant and especially minority immigrants, Negro or Mexican American, to migrate towards the central core of the city or urban areas. In 1960, according to the U.S. census, 72.6 percent of the

Negro population in the county of Los Angeles lived in the city of Los Angeles; 93.7 percent of this Negro population lived in the Watts and central district of the city of Los Angeles. Also according to the 1960 census, approximately 52 percent of the Mexican-American population of the county of Los Angeles lived in the city of Los Angeles, namely the Eastside Boyle Heights area.

To further clarify the situation, it has now accurately been projected by research analysis that if the current trend continues in the growth rate of Mexican Americans and Negro populations in the city of Los Angeles, by 1985 minorities will dominate the city of Los Angeles in population.

There has been now, I think, sufficient studies, research, and analysis, together with background and experience with the movements of large masses of rural immigration to fairly accurately predict the trends of involvement where urban planners will have to concentrate their efforts and expertise within the next few years if large metropolitan areas such as Los Angeles are to solve the many-faceted approach which must be taken in order to arrive at realistic and practical solutions in this area.

Certainly I think the majority of urban planners realize today that there is no single approach or panacea which will effectuate immediate, happy solutions to the issues. Certainly, having dealt with the Los Angeles and Watts problems before and after the Los Angeles riots of 1965, it is very evident to me that there must be several approaches taken in order to effectively handle the situation.

I might comment briefly from firsthand and personal experience on some of the issues which have arisen due to large influxes of immigrants from the rural areas and possible solutions to these situations:

As to Housing. The percentage of dilapidated and deteriorating housing increased from 19 percent in 1960 to 31 percent in 1965 in the south-central Watts area of Los Angeles. We were faced in this area with the absentee landlord situation and poor code enforcement programs. The housing is not the tenement-type situation we find in the East in Philadelphia, New York—but we have the single-family shacks with poor sanitation, heating, and so forth. A possible solution to this problem would be a strong code enforcement program effectuated in the area by the municipal or county government. Also low and moderate income housing projects, as contemplated under Section 221(d) (3) type programs, are sponsored by the Department of Housing and Urban Development. However, there must be Federal assistance on these programs to help the localities with seed money and administration money to get the local organizations past the initial stages to the first stage where FHA refunds portions of the monies spent. We are hopeful that the Federal government will come up with some solution in this area, as in Los Angeles in recent years there has not been any new sponsored Section 221(d) (3) projects by nonprofit corporations. They simply do not have the funds necessary to initiate the project. Fair housing legislation would be an additional aid in the States where there is a problem of minorities being allowed to purchase homes out of the ghettos. As you know, in California we are faced with Proposition 14 which nullified the Rumford Fair Housing Act and which itself was later nullified by the Supreme Court ruling that it is unconstitutional. Where you have segregated buying and selling practices by the local real estate agents and realtors, they usually work to keep the ghetto residents in and segregated from the rest of the community.

As to Education. A necessary concomitant to segregated housing is your segregated de facto educational systems. In the Eastside Boyle Heights area of the city of Los Angeles, which is predominantly Mexican American, the average number of school years completed by persons over 25 years of age was 9.7. In Watts, which is predominantly Negro, according to the 1965 census, persons of 25 and over have completed an average of 10.3 years of school. Most of the one-half-day sessions of school are in the minority communities of Los Angeles. Even some of the school buildings are substandard in the minority areas. Vocational training rather than academic and precollege training is stressed in many of the de facto segregated schools in Los Angeles. The Los Angeles School Board has a policy of allowing teachers to work closer to their homes or sites of their choice. This has worked a hardship on the minority sections of the cities in that the better teachers are asking for transfers from schools located in minority sections and are almost demanding additional pay and additional honorarium to teach school in minority sections. Possible solutions to these problems would be that school boundaries be drawn on an objective basis and not as it exists in some sections of Los Angeles where Jordon High School is 99 percent, practically 100 percent Negro and is only a half a mile away from another school which is 95 percent Caucasian, with a boundary line going down through the center.

Teachers, as a prerequisite to hiring, should agree to teach wherever the school board feels there is a need and an opening, rather than the school board having to pay additional honorariums for the teachers to teach in minority sections. Local communities should attempt to do away with the one-half-day sessions. Curriculums should be upgraded and constantly reviewed and implemented by suggestions by the PTA groups to see to it that there is an incentive for academic and college courses rather than, or in addition to, the trade and vocational curriculum. There should be more and better schools of better quality built in the minority sections.

The Supreme Court decision of 1954, handed down by Chief Justice Warren, which I was privileged to assist with some of the research for the attorneys who argued on behalf of the plaintiff, stated in the opinion that it was inconceivable that a child could excel in life today without a good education. We must adhere to this principle or we will be building into perpetuity lack of employment and increased welfare rolls for our children.

As to Employment. Employment figures for Watts in 1965 indicate that 33.2 percent of the males 14 years of age and older were not employed or in school. In east Los Angeles, the predominantly Mexican American community, during 1965, 22.9 percent of the male population of 14 years of age or older were not on jobs or in school. History books indicate that during the depression of 1932 when national unemployment reached 8 percent to 12 percent in some areas throughout the country, that this country evidenced one of its worst depressions. When we consider this fact in light of the situation existing in 1965, when 33 percent of males over

14 years of age were not working or not in school, then possibly we can get some insight into what motivated or triggered off the August 1965 holocaust in Los Angeles-Watts, Calif.

Recent surveys in the Los Angeles area have indicated that only 5 percent of the available jobs are for unskilled labor. Coinciding with the fact that 33 percent of males unemployed in the Watts area in 1965 were mainly in the areas of unskilled labor, we can see that there are no possibilities for employment for approximately 28 percent of the males in the Watts area over 14 years of age. And with automation taking its toll of unskilled labor positions, this figure of unemployment is certainly going to rise. For this 28 percent unemployed males, there is no hope of employment in a keen competitive society of today, there is no ability to head the household. Thus, the man of the house is unable to work and provide for his family; he leaves home feeling that his wife and children would do better on welfare.

What, then, is the solution to these problems of unemployment? No. 1, the majority of the jobs today for semiskilled and skilled labor require some type of preemployment examination. These examinations conducted by private employers or municipal, county, or State employers or Federal employers, such as the case may be, many times are nothing more than tests on mental agility and in a large number of cases have no rational relationship or relevance to the job for which the applicant is applying. Large numbers of the rural immigrants to the Los Angeles area have held previous jobs where they utilized their skills in handiwork. Maybe as a Mexican American they worked in leather factories in Mexico; or maybe the rural Negro from the South worked on a farm or plantation where he knows all there is to know about planting, woodwork, or handicrafts. Why not gear the preemployment examination to the skill of the employee, which may be manual rather than mental or intellectual. We have found that during the last decade more and more minorities are being allowed to run elevators at a time when elevator operators are being phased out by automation and pushbutton elevators. More and more Negroes are being hired as short order cooks and chefs in our highway restaurants and coffee shops at a time when short order cooks are being priced out of the economic living-wage-scale bracket.

Recently my corporation, in which I serve in the capacity of executive director, where we attempted to train people for employment under Manpower Training programs, was asked by the Federal Government to train minorities, Negroes, for janitors. And when I questioned, why janitors, I was informed, "Oh, these won't be the ordinary type janitors. They will be trained in the latest style and use of new detergents, electrical cleaning equipment, latest mops, etc." Here we are just building in second-class citizenship and low-paying semiskilled jobs, perpetuating the enigma of the low-skilled Negro and Mexican American.

As to Family Life. Figures show that in 1965, 33 percent of the people in Watts and 21 percent of the residents of the East-side Boyle Heights area of Los Angeles were from broken, divorced, and separated homes. In many cases this resulted from the father and husband not being able to locate work, leaving his wife to go to another State to seek employment, or abandoning the home so that the mother and children can receive welfare aid. Possible solutions to this problem could be reached by, as mentioned before, providing adequate homes at a decent monthly rental which poor people can afford. Possibly, with some provision for leasing with option to buy, when a nominal sum has been reached by either rental payments or a nominal down payment, the family could begin to purchase a low income or moderate income home under provisions of recent HUD legislation.

With decent home surroundings and possibly landlord-tenant training for the inhabitants of the home, to show them how to care for it and to preserve it, pride in ownership could contribute to the family taking an interest in the home and passing it on to the children so that they take an interest in their surroundings such as school, later community life, later leadership in the community and on to upstanding community citizens.

But where rent is so high that the average poverty family cannot afford to pay it, there are no rent supplement programs involved, the substandard and dilapidated housing inevitably contributes towards the family breakdown and dissolution of the home.

As to Health Needs. A 1964 survey of health conditions in the Watts and south-central area of Los Angeles by our agency indicated that there was a higher incidence of major diseases in this area than in all of the other sections of the city of Los Angeles put together. The close living conditions in the slum and dilapidated areas contribute greatly to the high incidence of contagious diseases.

Thus, better housing would also solve some of the health problems of the ghetto residents.

As to Other Solutions. The Travelers Aid Society has set up mobile stations to bring information on jobs, housing, and so forth, to newly arrived immigrants from rural areas. This has been a big help to Los Angeles. Also skill centers where nonskilled employable persons can receive some training to allow them to become employable.

As to Small Business Development. My own corporation's program to train, give guidance and counseling to potential new businessmen in the poverty area to allow them to eventually get funded and begin their own small businesses. This program, with the cooperation of the Small Business Administration has successfully started approximately 180 new businesses funded for a total of $2 million in 1 year's operation.

Last year at the June 1 and 2 White House Conference, which I was invited to attend by a call from the White House, my resolution that pockets of poverty which exist in the country with conditions similar to that of Watts with 30 percent unemployment, be declared an "economic disaster area" and that priority be given to those defense contract bids coming from companies with plants located or willing to locate in those areas to help eliminate the high unemployment ratio—this resolution was passed unanimously by the session and was reported in the Washington Post as one of the best recommendations coming from the White House Civil Rights Conference.

The second recommendation which I made at the White House

Conference, which was unanimously adopted, was that President Johnson appoint a Federal coordinator to expedite and coordinate Federal help and programs to these poverty-stricken economic disaster areas. I feel that this recommendation is still appropriate because experience has shown that there is a tremendous amount of bureaucratic redtape and administrative detail that is sufficient to frustrate the average local citizenry group, not to mention some of the organizations with more expert know-how, when they attempt to program with Federal, State, and other municipalities in order to solve some of the urban and rural problems in this area.

I wish to thank you for the invitation and the opportunity to appear before you this morning and share with you some of the problems and solutions which urban planners must come to grips with in planning for the future.

I might add here, in addition, the minority residents of the State of California have been faced with Proposition 14, whereby, by statewide referendum, no Unfair Housing Laws were done away with; and we were also unable to pass, on a referendum basis, a proposal to provide a hospital for the sick and needy people in the Watts area.

On a statewide basis, the residents of the State of California did not feel that the minority people, especially the people of Watts, should have a hospital to care for their medical ills.

I feel basically that these are the sick people who would not be willing to provide medical care for sick people, regardless of their race.

As I stated, I appreciate very much and want to thank you for the opportunity to appear here this morning. I will be happy to answer any questions you might have.

The **CHAIRMAN**: All right, we have a few minutes for questioning.

Do you have a question, Dr. Henderson?

Mr. **HENDERSON**: Yes, I would like to respond, you see.

Mr. Johnson, I appreciated very much your presentation and I am familiar with some of the things you laid out, having spent some time in the Watts area, having been asked by someone in Washington to do so, and I was requested to come back with some recommendations.

I am interested in one aspect of your presentation, and I would just like to see if you can throw a little light on it.

This question of the MDTA program, and training programs, trying to bring minority groups and unskilled people into trading areas that can lead them into employment, that is what I want to mention.

The whole question of janitors, various kinds of maids, all of these various kinds of jobs in which these people have been previously employed poses all kinds of problems.

Now, I think we know the basis of your statement and I agree with you. But in light of the increase in the opportunities in what are called the service-producing areas—hospitals, janitorial services, maintenance services, and the like—and in light of the fact that there have been technological innovations and advances which have really in essence upgraded these jobs—for example, janitors are not any longer janitors in the traditional sense—but they have simply changed the nomenclature.

But the person responsible for a large apartment building, for instance, in which there may be a staff of janitors and they have been given the nomenclature occupationally of maintenance engineers—I know that a rose by any other name smells just as sweet—but, for the moment, let's just assume that upgrading the title has accompanied the responsibilities that go with the job.

Now, the question I am getting to very simply is this: Should we—and I am thinking in terms of realistic thinking of knowledgeable people—should we really resist to the extent that we do training in these areas, assuming that it takes the form of the kind of thing I have tried to describe? Isn't the real question not that they seek to train them for these jobs, but the real question is the amount of balance there is in the kind of structure that prevails in the local training operation?

For example, suppose your balance would develop in the training of maintenance people and janitors and engineers, wouldn't the development of nurses aids, stenographers and secretaries, and file clerks follow?

What is your reaction to this?

Mr. JOHNSON: Well, I think you have posed really two problems here, and I will specifically address myself to your question with regard to janitorial services.

In the past, and of course, presently, and I think in the near and distant future as far as I can see, minorities and especially Negroes have the corner on janitor and maid-type services, and we definitely have developed a market there in that area.

In the janitorial service companies that we know of and which I have had experience dealing with, there are one or two people who are the supervisors, who are at the very top, the supervisor and the owner, at the top echelon level.

The rest are doing janitor work, cleaning, the work of maids, all unskilled labor type of personnel.

Now, the other part of the question that you posed to me involves the actual negotiations for contracts for the maintenance of these big office buildings or Federal office buildings or governmental office buildings, or even private office buildings.

This is separate and apart from the type of people who do the work. There is difficulty on the part of a minority janitorial service company in getting the contract to perform services; and this is a little different from the training program.

As I mentioned, it appears as though we already have a corner on maids and janitors. There may be innovations in mops or detergents or what have you, but I think this does not entail much training.

Since we have such a good representation in this area, we are of the feeling that we would do better utilizing government funds and government assistance to get minorities into programs where they have not been before; and why not in the business area where they could own their own businesses; why not in management, at the management level; or, how about training them so they can hold executive or higher positions; or, even as you say, the other standard-type jobs, and these last two are really skilled positions. And I think this is where the impetus is really needed, because it does appear that we do have the corner already on the elevator operators, maids, and janitors, and jobs like that.

The CHAIRMAN: All right, Mr. Gallegos.

Mr. GALLEGOS: Mr. Johnson, is your agency aware of any research that is being done on the current in-migration pattern into Los Angeles from other rural or urban centers? For example, has that immigration into Watts slowed down at all as a result of the riot there?

I think it is important to know if the notoriety which came out as a result of the riots in the Watts area has caused people to say that they are not going there, that they will go somewhere else?

Secondly, the question of Mexican Americans into the urban areas, that are coming from a rural to an urban type of society—Is it a different culture? Or is this in-migration coming from moderately urban into urban?

Mr. JOHNSON: I think that the biggest problem that comes to the fore on the in-migration problem is caused by those who come strictly from the rural to the urban area; they do not have the skills which are consistent with the skills that are required in the metropolitan area. We are confronted here with the Mexican American coming from maybe even Mexico, which is not far from Los Angeles, right into the metropolitan area proper.

Now, when they get there, they more or less stay in the east side of the Boyle Heights area. They have their own traditional mores and customs and cultures and they want to maintain these, and the Mexican American more or less stays in this area.

Now, in the Watts area, it is true that many of the rural Negroes migrate into the Watts area; although, contrary to the popular belief as to the concept about the Watts riots publicity, this is not the staging area as such for rural Negro entry. Statistics have shown that 60 percent to 70 percent of the Negroes living in the Watts area have lived there for 5 years or more.

So, this is not a transitory or staging area for rural Negroes to migrate into.

The real problem seems to be—in fact, this may not be a problem—but the people who come there, many of them, like that area. They have friends there. Housing is a little cheaper and the cost of living might be a little cheaper there than in the Metropolitan Los Angeles area.

But, what we are saying is that, even though these are rural people, they have the same rights to equal education, decent housing, decent health standards, and decent opportunities for jobs, even though they are in the Watts area. They are not really interested in leaving the Watts area. To the contrary, the evidence shows that they do not really want to leave the Watts area. But, what they are saying is that they should be given an opportunity to be on the same economic level and on the same social level that other people in other sections of the county have available to them.

The CHAIRMAN: I will recognize Dr. Davis.

Mr. LAWRENCE DAVIS: Now, I suppose that, as I have done, you have heard some of the testimony yesterday and today.

What I would like to ask you is, have you heard of any movement or any thought of the possibility of approaching foundations, nonprofit foundations, in an effort to get funds so that many of these programs which require the local areas to have a certain amount of funds, can be acquired or matched?

Mr. JOHNSON: Your suggestion is a very excellent one. That is a conclusion we came to several months ago. Our corporation itself is a nonprofit corporation. Contrary to the usual statement that it was not intended to be that way, we did mean for ours to be nonprofit when we set it up; it did not just happen to be that way.

But, it is a nonprofit corporation, meaning that we are tax exempt and persons or foundations who donate to our corporation can make a deduction under Section 170-C of the Internal Revenue Code.

Now, we have contacted just about all of the foundations in the State of California and we have gone out of the State to the Northwest and we have gone through practically the entire western portion of the country; and, so far, I can say the results have been real meager. In fact, we only have one donation of $100.

It certainly does not do anything for a housing project which at the optimum, we feel, would be about $1½ million.

We raised this issue at the White House Civil Rights Conference—the question of how could indigent people and organizations get some funds to help with the ghetto housing problems to develop this low-income-type housing, and realizing that it takes maybe $40,000 or $50,000 to initiate a housing project to the extent of about 150 units. How can we get $35,000 or $40,000 or $50,000? And when we are dealing with people such as the Watts area residents—I would say that definitely 80 percent of them would classify as poverty persons—and certainly the eastside Mexican Americans—and most of them, or at least a goodly amount of them, 30 percent of them—are unemployed; so it is very difficult to raise this amount of money.

We raised this with the panel and one of the people there asked if we did not feel there should be some community participation, and they asked, "Why don't you collect nickels and dimes from the residents of these areas?"

Of course, this suggestion was ridiculous, and the person who was running the panel so stated, and that was the end of it.

But it is going to take Federal assistance to get these programs off the ground. We have been trying for 3 years, in every way we know how, to find some way of helping to get this housing in these areas for these needy people, and we have some expertise in this area.

In many conferences we have attended with the local citizenry, in fraternal groups, and with social groups, we have asked many questions about where do we go, who do we see, where do we start, how can we get some funding in order to obtain decent housing in our area.

Nobody has the answer.

It was not too long ago that one of these people from the East traveled through Watts—and this was not Dr. Henderson, but he was one of the specialists from Washington who took the

Cook's tour—and he went back and as I understand he reported that there was no need for housing in the Watts area.

The **CHAIRMAN**: I think we have about run out of time for questions.

We certainly do want to thank you, Mr. Johnson, for your fine visitation.

Mr. **JOHNSON**: Thank you, gentlemen.

The **CHAIRMAN**: The Commission will now recognize Mrs. Willie Anderson of Tucson, Ariz.

STATEMENT OF MRS. WILLIE ANDERSON

Mrs. **ANDERSON**: My testimony is on social and economic problems of residents of Marana, Ariz., which is a rural community located 20 miles northwest of Tucson, Ariz.

I am Mrs. Willie Anderson. I live at 2025 Jason Vista, Tucson, Ariz. I am married and mother of two small children. Presently, I am employed with the Tucson nursery school located on South Plummer as a teacher's aid.

My parents moved to Marana, Ariz., from Oklahoma when I was 9 years old. I spent the remainder of my life in Marana until November 1966, at which time I moved to Tucson to seek employment.

I attended school in Marana, completing the 11th grade. I got married in 1961. My husband always had a difficult time finding a job. He worked at different jobs, driving tractors and other farm machinery. Also, he worked as an irrigation attendant.

The migrant opportunity program advised my husband to be relocated to Tucson in order that he could have a better chance of getting a job. My husband works at Volpe Motor Company as an auto detail man. His salary is $300 per month. I got my job through the migrant opportunity program with the Tucson nursery school. My salary is $1.35 per hour. The combined income helps to support our family.

The change from rural living to urban living did not create any problems for us which could not be solved by us.

The **CHAIRMAN**: Thank you, Mrs. Anderson. We would like to ask some questions now.

Are you a little bit nervous?

Mrs. **ANDERSON**: Yes.

The **CHAIRMAN**: You do not need to be. We certainly do appreciate your appearance here and your presentation. We are very much interested in hearing your personal reactions.

First, as a matter of background, let me ask you this question. Do you have a family?

Mrs. **ANDERSON**: Yes, I have two children, and their ages are 4 and 2.

The **CHAIRMAN**: Is your husband working?

Mrs. **ANDERSON**: Yes, he works at Volpe Motor Company here in town.

The **CHAIRMAN**: What kind of work is that?

Mrs. **ANDERSON**: He details cars; he is what they call an auto detail man, you know, he cleans up the cars.

The **CHAIRMAN**: Now, when you were living in Marana, what kind of work did your husband do?

Mrs. ANDERSON: Farmwork, driving tractors, combining, irrigating, and just about anything that he could do, digging out ditches and anything.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, who takes care of your children when both of you are working?

Mrs. ANDERSON: Now?

The CHAIRMAN: Now, yes.

Mrs. ANDERSON: I take them to work with me. I work in a nursery school so they can go along.

The CHAIRMAN: I see.

I will recognize Mr. Gibson.

Mr. GIBSON: I am interested in the experience you and your husband had when you went to California. You said that you had heard through friends that there were opportunities there. Is that right?

Mrs. ANDERSON: Yes.

Mr. GIBSON: Was this someone who had been previously living in Marana and who had moved to California?

Mrs ANDERSON: Yes.

Mr. GIBSON: Was he employed there at the time?

Mrs. ANDERSON: Yes.

Mr. GIBSON: Then, you and your husband moved out there?

Mrs. ANDERSON: Yes.

Mr. GIBSON: Did he give you any indication or did you discuss with him the kind of work that your husband might find in California?

Mrs. ANDERSON: Well, he said farmwork paid more.

Mr. GIBSON: He was doing farmwork?

Mrs. ANDERSON: Yes, and he said that it paid from $1.50 to $1.75 an hour. My husband was only making sometimes 85 cents to 90 cents an hour working at Marana.

Mr. GIBSON: I see.

Now, if you will be patient with me, I would like to trace a little bit exactly how this went.

He was visiting in Marana, this gentleman who was responsible for your moving; he was visiting in Marana at that time?

Mrs. ANDERSON: Yes, he was my husband's brother-in-law, and they left Marana and went to California looking for better jobs and better housing, you know.

Mr. GIBSON: You say they. Who do you mean?

Mrs. ANDERSON: He carried his family; he had a wife and four kids.

Mr. GIBSON: Was he back on a visit, or did he write to you, or how did you get the information?

Mrs. ANDERSON: Yes, he came back to visit.

Mr. GIBSON: Now, what part of California was this again?

Mrs. ANDERSON: Blythe, and of course really it was about 10 miles from Blythe, near a small town called Ripley. It was on a farm there.

Mr. GIBSON: You and your husband, I suppose, talked over what he had said.

Mrs. ANDERSON: Yes.

Mr. GIBSON: And did you have any children at that time?

Mrs. ANDERSON: Yes, one.

Mr. GIBSON: Then you decided that you should go to see what the opportunities were at Blythe, is that right?

Mrs. ANDERSON: Well, he went first. He left with his brother-in-law; and then 3 weeks later, he came back to get me and I went.

Mr. GIBSON: With whom did he stay when he went out there?

Mrs. ANDERSON: His folks, his mother and father.

Mr. GIBSON: Your husband's mother and father were in California?

Mrs. ANDERSON: Yes, they already lived there, too.

Mr. GIBSON: Then he came back for you and the child?

Mrs. ANDERSON: Yes.

Mr. GIBSON: And then you went to California together?

Mrs. ANDERSON: Yes.

Mr. GIBSON: Whom did you stay with when you got there?

Mrs. ANDERSON: Well, when he came back here, he had already rented a house, and we moved right into the house that he had rented.

Mr. GIBSON: Had he been working before he came back to get you?

Mrs. ANDERSON: Yes.

Mr. GIBSON: Now, some of these questions you may not choose to answer, but we are very interested in just exactly how this came about.

Did he have any money saved when he came to Marana? Did he have $10, or $20, or $30 or more?

Mrs. ANDERSON: Yes, he had about $20.

Mr. GIBSON: So, you went out to California and moved into the house which he had rented previously?

Mrs. ANDERSON: Yes.

Mr. GIBSON: He then continued to work at this job?

Mrs. ANDERSON: Yes.

Mr. GIBSON: Then what did you do?

Mrs. ANDERSON: What did I do?

Mr. GIBSON: Yes.

Mrs. ANDERSON: Well, I didn't do anything.

Mr. GIBSON: You stayed home?

Mrs. ANDERSON: Yes.

Mr. GIBSON: How old was the child at that time?

Mrs. ANDERSON: A year and about 5 months.

Mr. GIBSON: Is this a community—was this the same community where his mother and father lived and where his brother-in-law lived, and so forth?

Mrs. ANDERSON: Well, where we lived was a camp. This one woman owned the place, and we lived in a cabin. She rented out these little cabins at this camp.

Mr. GIBSON: How much money was your husband making an hour?

Mrs. ANDERSON: A dollar.

Mr. GIBSON: So, this was a little better than it had been in Marana?

Mrs. ANDERSON: Yes.

Mr. GIBSON: Now, how long did you stay before you decided that you wanted to come back to Marana?

Mrs. ANDERSON: Six months.

Mr. GIBSON: Can you tell me how you arrived at the decision that the opportunity you thought had been there was not there?

Mrs. ANDERSON: Well, at first the work was real well in the summertime. He had plenty of work. The melons were getting ripe, so they pulled melons and pitched melons, and then he drove a combine.

But in the winter months, all of the crops were gathered, all of the work was already done, so he couldn't find any work. So he finally got this job digging ditches on a farm and what not, for just a little while, and then he did not have any work.

We managed to save enough money to buy an old car and we saved enough money to get back to Marana.

Mr. GIBSON: About when would you say you decided to go back to Marana?

Mrs. ANDERSON: In November, after 6 months had passed.

Mr. GIBSON: When did you start thinking about going back?

Mrs. ANDERSON: Oh, we talked about it for 3 or 4 weeks.

Mr. GIBSON: Why was that?

Mrs. ANDERSON: Well, it was not too much better than it was at Marana. Even though he made a little bit more money, everything was higher, but this still wasn't as good, you know, as he thought it would be. The housing was at least as bad and even worse than Marana. It was real hot up there. The houses were raggedy. It would come a dust storm, the wind would blow, and everything in the house would shake, and the dust would blow in through all of the cracks. It was just bad.

Mr. GIBSON: When you decided to come back, you had gotten a car and you had saved a little money, and did he come ahead of you?

Mrs. ANDERSON: No, we just took off.

Mr. GIBSON: Where were you planning to sleep when you got back?

Mrs. ANDERSON: Well, we knew that my mother was here, so we knew we could go there to stay.

Mr. GIBSON: I see, thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: I will recognize Dr. Henderson.

Mr. HENDERSON: How did your husband get the job at the Volpe Motor Company in Tucson?

Mrs. ANDERSON: Well, after I started working at the day care, he began going to different—well, he started going to this employment service here in town applying to them to find a job.

So, he got this job at Volpe, he just went there, and after 2 or 3 days, they hired him.

Mr. HENDERSON: If I understand you correctly, it was on his own initiative that he pursued the job and that he did seek out the employment service, am I correct in that understanding? And he was unsuccessful in getting a job through the employment service, but by continuing to search, he did find a job for himself?

Mrs. ANDERSON: Yes.

Mr. HENDERSON: So, basically, in this individual instance, the employment service was not able to meet his needs?

Mrs. ANDERSON: No, all they could offer was farm jobs.

Mr. HENDERSON: They did offer him farm jobs?

Mrs. ANDERSON: Yes.

Mr. **HENDERSON**: Did they offer him any other kinds of jobs, do you recall?

Mrs. **ANDERSON**: Yes, as a dishwasher at some hotel.

Mr. **HENDERSON**: But he still sought another type of work?

Mrs. **ANDERSON**: Yes.

Mr. **HENDERSON**: Let me ask you just very quickly how much education your husband has?

Mrs. **ANDERSON**: Well, he went to the seventh grade.

Mr. **HENDERSON**: What about yourself?

Mrs. **ANDERSON**: I went to my junior year in high school.

Mr. **HENDERSON**: So he has now been at the Volpe Company approximately since October. Is that right?

Mrs. **ANDERSON**: No, 8 months.

Mr. **HENDERSON**: Thank you very much.

Mr. **LAWRENCE DAVIS**: I have often heard it said that the reason poor people are in their plight, those who came from a poor neighborhood, was that they did not want to improve their condition, that they did not want to work, that they did not want to improve their conditions.

Now, do you find from your experience that your friends want better homes and do you find them wanting jobs and do you find them willing to train for better job opportunities?

Mrs. **ANDERSON**: Yes, most of my friends want a better life. They want things for their children that they didn't have. They want decent houses and better jobs with better pay.

I think if they have a chance, just a little help, they would gladly take the chance.

Mr. **LAWRENCE DAVIS**: Thank you.

The **CHAIRMAN**: Any further questions?

I will recognize Dr. Jackson.

Mrs. **JACKSON**: How many brothers and sisters do you have?

Mrs. **ANDERSON**: I have seven brothers and one sister.

Mrs. **JACKSON**: How far did they go in school?

Mrs. **ANDERSON**: Well, they are still going to school. I am the oldest; and the youngest is 2 years old.

Mrs. **JACKSON**: Do you miss your former home in Marana?

Mrs. **ANDERSON**: No, not at all.

Mrs. **JACKSON**: You do not miss anything about it?

Mrs. **ANDERSON**: No.

Mrs. **JACKSON**: What do you enjoy beyond the comfort of your new home here in Tucson? What are some of the things that you do that you actually enjoy?

Mrs. **ANDERSON**: Well, for one thing, my husband, if he decides he does not want to work at Volpe anymore, well, we don't have to move just because he doesn't work there.

If he decides to go out and paint the house black, he can paint the house black because it is ours.

What I really like and think about, most of the people in Marana, just like ourselves before we moved, they don't know what it is to get up and turn a faucet on and get hot water; and they don't know what it is to get into a bathtub, in a bathroom, you know, and take a bath. They have to heat their water on the stove and take a bath in a tin tub.

They don't know what it is to have heat in their house. They have to heat with butane or wood.

That is what I am thankful for, and these are the things I enjoy most.

Mrs. **JACKSON**: Are you beginning to enjoy or to make the acquaintance of some new friends here in Tucson?

Mrs. **ANDERSON**: Well, yes, I have friends up here that used to live at Marana, and I have made a lot of new friends at work and so on. I am not lonesome at all.

Mrs. **JACKSON**: Thank you.

Mr. **GALLEGOS**: Do you think your brothers and sisters will finish school? What kind of a school do they go to? Do you think that the way things are going, they are going to finish school?

Mrs. **ANDERSON**: Well, I hope so. I have a brother 19. He is in his senior year and he will graduate in June.

I think they will finish school at least I hope they will.

Mr. **GALLECOS**: Tell me something about the school they go to. Is it mixed with all groups; or is it limited?

Mrs. **ANDERSON**: Yes, it is all mixed: white, colored, Spanish, Indian; and it is a good school.

Mr. **GALLEGOS**: What kind of special help do the students in school get? Do they get help from the Neighborhood Youth Corps, do they have any kinds of programs?

Mrs. **ANDERSON**: Yes, they do.

Mr. **GALLEGOS**: Do they get them part-time jobs?

Mrs. **ANDERSON**: Yes, my brother was working at this Youth Corps after school.

Mr. **GALLEGOS**: Thank you.

Mr. **HENDERSON**: Let me ask just one more question.

One of the problems we are wrestling with here is the whole question of rural poverty.

One aspect of this has to do with the question of trying to improve conditions of people in rural poverty wherever they are, in contrast to trying to help them find ways to make adjustments if they move to urban areas.

Now, you happen to be a person who has moved from a so-called rural area into better conditions in a city.

How do you feel, what possibilities, what kinds of things are there—do you think there is any hope that can be projected for bringing Marana, for example, to a point where people can enjoy the kind of life that you are presently enjoying? What are your reactions to this kind of possibility?

Mrs. **ANDERSON**: Well, I think if the farmers would build better houses and give a little higher pay that the people would not mind staying there.

But most of the houses on all the farms in Marana are just not decent and people just get tired of living like that all of their lives.

There is one farmer there in particular who owns almost half of Marana. He owns farms here and there and everywhere else. The houses that he has are some of the worst houses in Marana, and he makes people pay rent on them. The people work there all year long.

I know that one Christmas my husband was working there. The people were just dying for a Christmas bonus, you know, they thought they would get $15 or $20.

So, Christmas came around and he gave everybody a sack of candy and said, "Next year, bigger crops."

Another man at one camp gave everyone a new door for their house, a wooden door.

I think if there was just some kind of way that these farmers could be made to realize that these people don't want to live like this, that they want something better out of life, maybe this would help.

Mr. **HENDERSON**: Now, you said you had some friends here in Tucson who were originally from Marana.

Of those who leave Marana, of those you know who have left Marana, can you give us some notion as to their ages or anything about them?

Mrs. **ANDERSON**: Well, this one friend lives in the same neighborhood we do. He is 24 years old. He works at Marana in the Marana school, but he was able to get a home here in town and later on to get married.

Mr. **HENDERSON**: Did he work as a janitor in the school?

Mrs. **ANDERSON**: Yes, and he is still working there.

Mr. **HENDERSON**: At Marana?

Mrs. **ANDERSON**: Yes.

Mr. **LAWRENCE DAVIS**: Is your father living?

Mrs. **ANDERSON**: No, I have a stepfather.

Mr. **NEIL DAVIS**: Is he living at home with your mother and the children?

Mrs. **ANDERSON**: Well, he worked on a farm. But it is not the same with him; when I was at home growing up, he had what you would call a steady job. You know, whether it rained or not, he still got paid $76 a week. When I was growing up, it wasn't so bad for me.

Mr. **LAWRENCE DAVIS**: But you did grow up in a home that was generally like these others in Marana?

Mrs. **ANDERSON**: Yes.

Mr. **FISCHER**: Why did your family move from Oklahoma to Arizona?

Mrs. **ANDERSON**: Well, for better conditions here.

Mr. **FISCHER**: And did your family do farmwork in Oklahoma too?

Mrs. **ANDERSON**: Yes.

The **CHAIRMAN**: We are very grateful to you, Mrs. Anderson, not only for your giving us your personal experiences, but also telling us so much about the general area.

I know that the members of the Commission appreciate your remarks very much.

Mrs. **ANDERSON**: Thank you.

The **CHAIRMAN**: Now, again, the Commission is working straight through the lunch hour. We must wind up the testimony about 3 o'clock this afternoon because we will be going on a field trip.

We want to be sure we get all of the scheduled witnesses finished before 3 o'clock. I would caution the Commission again that we want to finish, so please be a brief as possible with your questions so that we may get through.

Now, the Commission will recognize Mr. Arthur Hawkins and

Mr. E. P. Stephenson. Mr. Stephenson is executive director of Neighborhood House, Richmond, Calif.

Now, please identify yourselves for the record and please proceed to make your presentations, and then if we have some time, the Commission will ask questions.

First, please identify yourselves.

Mr. HAWKINS: I am Arthur Hawkins and I am a community worker in Richmond Community Development Administration project in Richmond, Calif.

Mr. STEPHENSON: I am E. P. Stephenson, executive director, Neighborhood House.

The CHAIRMAN: All right, you are each allowed 15 minutes

Now, please identify yourselves for the record and please propound some questions to you.

If you have written memoranda, with your presentation and recommendations, please leave those behind so we may incorporate them into the record.

Now, you may proceed.

STATEMENT OF ARTHUR HAWKINS

Mr. HAWKINS: Mr. Chairman, I am Arthur Hawkins, and I am here today to speak to you on the problems of minorities in urban communities, such as Richmond, Calif.

Richmond is a very unusual community in many ways. The majority of the population arrived during and since World War II, when the population grew in size from 23,000 to 100,000. This growth was due mostly to the shipbuilding industry in Richmond during World War II.

This brief period of growth left the community life little time to deal with the physical and social problems resulting from the rapid growth. The most dramatic factor of the population change was that of racial composition.

In 1940, only 250 Negroes lived in Richmond. By 1950, there were over 14,000 nonwhites (most of them Negroes) living within the city limits and large groups of Negroes living in adjacent areas. At present 22 percent of Richmond's population is nonwhite (with estimates of Negro population as high as 23,000).

The growth of Negro population in Richmond represents the movement of many southern rural Negroes to northern urban areas during the war years when employment opportunities were available. These Negroes or Negro people were poorly educated and unprepared for urban life. They located in the only housing available to them in flat, unattractive, badly serviced sections of the community. While there has been some slight improvement in housing, most of Richmond's Negro population still resides in these poorly serviced areas.

An example of this is North Richmond which lies one-third in the city limits and two-thirds in the country. It is a marshy area which is surrounded by railroad tracks, industry, and the bay. Approximately 16 percent of the families in North Richmond have an annual income of $1,999 or less, another 23 percent have an annual income of from $2,000 to $4,000. Over one-fourth of the male force is unemployed (compared to 8 percent for the country).

ICS 292

The education of persons over 14 years of age is far below that of the country population as a whole. The Negro and white children in this area (and in other areas of the community) attend de facto segregated schools below the high school level. The Richmond or North Richmond area has many social problems. It is a problem to the city, the residents, and their neighbors.

The years that followed World War II found the Negro communities facing even more problems. The Government had authorized thousands of housing projects for the shipyard workers and their families to live in during the war. After the war, however, these projects were torn down, leaving most of these families without housing.

This forced the relocation of Negro families to other parts of the city and to even less adequate housing. The better housing facilities that were available in the Richmond community were either too expensive or else realtors and landlords discriminated in the sale and rental of these units to these families. The Negro families that were homeowners, for example, in North Richmond had their share of problems and still do.

Banks and loan companies refused to take the risk of loaning money to these families for the following reasons:

(a) The banks and loan companies follow policies of racial discrimination.

(b) Two-thirds of the community of North Richmond is unincorporated and is not a part of the city.

(c) Most of the families don't have steady jobs and have poor credit ratings due to part-time jobs and continuous layoffs by employers.

(d) The property that these families put up as collateral in most instances is run down and practically worthless.

Social Disorganization

Unemployment, broken homes, and poor housing are most prevalent in the "Western Strip" of Richmond which includes the neighborhoods of North Richmond, the Iron Triangle, and South Richmond.

In contrast to conditions in Negro neighborhoods, a predominantly white working-class area in San Pablo (which is right next to Richmond) reported an unemployment rate of 7.6 percent, whereas the Iron Triangle, which was more than half Negro, reported a 19.7 percent unemployment rate.

Juvenile Delinquency

Information from official records collected by the police and sheriff's offices showed that the highest proportion of juvenile offenders lived in the South Richmond area.

For example, 77 juveniles had committed offenses during a 1-year period. Since the census listed 171 persons under 18 years of age living in the area, nearly all of the children in the 12- to 17-year bracket must have acquired police records. It might be noted that police records aren't the most accurate.

High school kids answering school questionnaires showed white and Negro teenagers reporting about the same proportion of police contacts. The Negro youth, however, had a much higher proportion of police reported records.

Life Cycle

The average age and family composition of households vary in different regions. Many retired couples and individuals live in the Civic Center area, downtown, and in middle-class residential parts of El Cerrito, Kensington, and Point Richmond.

North and South Richmond on the other hand, are predominantly composed of younger and larger families. In the Civic Center area, only one-fifth of the households have young children, while in the North and South Richmond areas over one-half of the households have children under the age of 6.

Socioeconomic Status

Using occupation, income, value of housing, and level of education as an index, Kensington and El Cerrito hills are very high in socioeconomic status, while the Western Strip and parts of San Pablo are relatively poor, and predominantly working class.

Median family incomes according to the 1965 census, for example, were $10,757 in Kensington, while North Richmond was $4,515.

Racial Composition of Growth

Prior to World War II, less than 1 percent of the population was Negro in the western part of the country. The war years brought the percentage of Negroes up to about 10 percent.

It climbed to 12 percent in 1960 and to 18 percent according to the 1965 survey. Three-fourths of the overall growth in the western country's population during the last 5 years is due to the increase in Negro population.

All of the increase in the Negro population was confined to the Western Strip. Due to the increased population in the Western Strip, the degree of racial segregation in the western country has clearly sharpened during the past 5 years.

The percentage of Negroes in the Western Strip increased from 36 percent to 46 percent during the period, and actually declined in other areas.

Family Size

Almost one-third of the households in the Western Strip have five or more occupants, where fewer than one-fifth of the households in the remainder of the western country contained so many.

The sharpest contrast in the family size is between Negroes and whites. Twenty-eight percent of the Negro households contain six or more persons as contrasted with 8 percent of the white households. In North Richmond, which is 93 percent Negro, 30 percent of all households contain six or more persons. National figures in 1960 showed that 23 percent of urban Negro families, as contrasted to 9 percent of white families, were headed by women.

In western Contra Costa County, according to the 1965 survey, 22 percent of Negro as contrasted to 9.5 percent of white households had female heads, approximately the same as the national 5 years prior. Negro families with female heads in the western country have increased, especially in North Richmond where it has climbed from 23 percent to 29 percent.

Occupations

The Richmond area is primarily industrial. About three-fifths of the employed are manual workers, and two-fifths are "white collar" workers. Occupations are unevenly distributed in the different residential areas, however. In 1960, 60 percent of employed males in Kensington and El Cerrito were professional; in North Richmond only 7 percent were.

One-third of the employed males in North Richmond are unskilled manual laborers as contrasted with the areawide proportion of only 8 percent. Negroes in Richmond tend to fill the lower occupational positions. Thirty-seven percent of employed men are unskilled as contrasted with 15 percent of white men.

Thirty percent of employed Negro women are unskilled or domestics compared to only 6 percent for white women. According to the 1965 survey, 93 percent of the men in western Contra Costa County between the ages of 15 and 69 are employed.

Among white males about 94 percent are employed in each age bracket from 15 years through 64 years. Among Negroes, however, only during their thirties and forties are as many as 94 percent employed; this is the age bracket in which almost 100 percent of white males are employed.

A majority (58 percent) of Negro teenage boys out of school are not employed, and a quarter of the Negro men in their twenties do not have work.

Housing, unemployment, schools, and delinquency are among the major problems that the Negro has once he moves to the urban community.

Part II of this testimony deals with the poverty programs in the Richmond area that have helped in many successful ways to put the Negroes of the community into the mainstream of society.

PART II—EFFECTIVENESS OF POVERTY PROGRAMS IN THE RICHMOND AREA AND HOW THEY CAN BE MORE EFFECTIVE

There is no question that the poverty programs in the Richmond area contributed to a better community, economy, and society; however, they are not designed to create jobs in numbers equal to the number of hard-core unemployed.

Neighborhood House, a settlement that has been in North Richmond for some 14 years, has introduced many new and unusual programs to the residents of that community. Among the programs that have been offered are: Job-upgrading; on-the-job training; day care nurseries; tutoring classes; study halls; day camps for children; and the Neighborhood Youth Corps programs.

One example of the effectiveness of these programs is the tutorial program. The tutors in the community are in close contact with each pupil's teacher so that the tutor will know in what area the pupil needs help.

The teacher, on the other hand, reports to the tutor how the pupil is doing in a given area due to the efforts of the tutor. This type of individualized attention has had great success since it was first instituted in the North Richmond area.

Another example is the job-upgrading program (JUP). Individuals are given courses in remedial reading and basic math, among others. They are taught how to fill out job application forms and even tutored on how to pass a drivers test since a lot of jobs require that individuals have drivers licenses. Job Upgrading is designed for school dropouts, the hard-core youth in the community, and adults that have been refused jobs because they couldn't read or write well enough to fill out an application, thus eliminating them from available jobs.

Neighborhood House, in offering these programs, has been vital to the community of North Richmond.

Another poverty program is the Richmond Community Development Demonstration project (RCDDP). This project has concentrated on the target of deprived areas of the community other than North Richmond.

This project is based on the theory of new careers development and self-help programs. This demonstration project took 25 poor people from the community, hired them as new careerists and placed them in worthwhile and meaningful jobs, which will be described briefly. These 25 individuals ranged in education from the eighth grade to one individual who was a school teacher in one of the Southern States. Employmentwise, some of these individuals had not found employment for 2 years; some were receiving welfare and some were from large families in which only one member worked.

Five of these individuals were placed in the Richmond schools; their title is school community workers. Their function is to lessen the workload of the teacher by counseling difficult children, to make home visits, to talk over children's problems with the parents. The main function, in my opinion, of the school community worker is to bridge the communication gap between the school and the community. This is very important in a school such as Verde, located in North Richmond, where 100 percent of the students are Negro and close to 100 percent of the teachers are Caucasian.

Five of the other individuals are placed in the police department and their title is police community relations aid (PCRA).

Their function is to bridge the gaps between the police and the community. With police and community problems occurring throughout the community, there can be no doubt that the PCRA is a vital factor in bringing about better communications between the police and the people of the community. After extensive training, the PCRA is able to interpret the police department to the community and also relate to the police department the feelings that the community has concerning the police department. The PCRA is a vital factor also in setting up community meetings with troubled youth and the police department in order that both parties can better understand each other.

Other new careerists in the RCDDP are the probation aids. These new careerists have the following titles:

The detached worker makes contact with community agencies and resources to assist in developing programs with the probation department. This might include making contact with agencies for meeting space, counseling program development and other appropriate resources; contacting business and industrial organizations in relation to employment, equipment, and support.

The workers also make contact with parents of members to involve them in the activity of a teenage gang group served by the probation department and to enlist their interest and support of the program.

The juvenile hall counselor aids assist in recreation programs, tutoring, and other special educational programs. They help to deal with the special problems of children in detention at juvenile hall who need individual attention. For example, one careerist has started an intake program, another is involved in efforts to improve school programs; and, a third is involved with neglected children.

The Guide assistant participates in group sessions with delinquent girls in this day treatment program and assists on trips, makes immediate followup home visits with absent girls, and identifies and develops community resources for participants with special reference to education, vocational counseling and training, recreation, and health.

Two workers were assigned to the Survey Research Center at the University of California.

These workers conducted surveys throughout the Richmond area. The data gathered is very valuable to the government and the people in order that they may evaluate the RCDDP and plan new programs and efforts based on the facts uncovered.

Most of the information in Part I of this testimony came from the workers assigned to Survey Research Center.

Eight other individuals were assigned as community workers to low income organizations like neighborhood councils, churches, tenants councils, and others. The work of these organizations ranges from recreational-educational efforts to protests. The function of the community worker is to be a resource person, as well as organizer for programs. I would like to give an example of how a community worker works with a community organization and with what success.

As a community worker, I am assigned to the Welfare Rights Organization of Contra Costa County. This organization is composed of individuals who receive welfare or are potential welfare recipients.

The purpose of this organization is to educate the community on rules and regulations governing the welfare department and to act as advocates before public agencies for clients who depend on aid for their livelihood—welfare, social security, old age pension, and so on.

As the organizer for this organization, I am familiar with many of the rules of the welfare department. My job is to assign individual cases to the members designated as consultants, or advocates, and also to organize strategy and various organizational meetings. The Welfare Rights Organization (WRO) has a very significant success story.

In 1966, it came to the attention of the organization that a "slave labor" project was being conducted in Contra Costa County by the welfare department. WRO approached the county board of supervisors and objected to the use of AFDC fathers cleaning out flood canals without pay. These AFDC fathers were given wage credits, not paychecks; in other words, they had to work a certain number of hours before they could receive their welfare checks. If a recipient refused to work, he would be taken off welfare. WRO met with the National Association of Social Workers and the California Social Workers Organization, GRIP, Laborers Union, among others, and brought pressure to bear on the board of supervisors to stop the "slave labor" project. Just recently, with the help of the WRO, the county welfare department wrote and submitted a proposal to the local Economic Opportunity Committee for approval. This proposal called for the payment of wages for work done by recipients, not wage credits. This proposal has been approved by the local Economic Opportunity Council and is now in Sacramento for the State approval. The significance of this fight with the local welfare department is that poor people from the community succeeded for the first time in changing policies and programs that affect their lives and being able to have some say in the new programs that are to come in the future. Thus, WRO has shown that poor, simple, everyday community people can bring about social and physical changes and have a say about policies and programs that govern them.

I would like to give an example of the advocacy role that welfare rights members and organizers play in the community. A family came to the organization with a bad housing problem in which the landlord refused to make necessary repairs. I called the health department and had them inspect the house. They found the house unfit for small children and condemned the premises. The family went to the housing authority and were told they had to wait their turn on the waiting list. Knowing that families in need of housing because of public action (like condemnation) get top priority, I went back to the housing authority with the family, explained the law, and acquired housing for them that same day.

Another example is when the housing authority served an eviction notice on a particular family because they were behind in their rent. WRO would not usually involve itself in this problem, but due to the fact that family received welfare and two of the children had recently undergone surgery, we felt we must intervene. Consequently, we talked with the housing authority and convinced them to reconsider their actions and they did. The family is now paying off their back rent in installments and the housing authority will pay all the court costs incurred by having the eviction notice served.

The main point in these examples is that public agencies seem not to care. The poor don't know their rights and someone has to intervene.

The Neighborhood House and RCDDP is losing large sums of needed funds to continue their work due to the cutback in War on Poverty funds. Both these agencies' work has only just begun. More funds are needed to continue the fine work they have started. The effectiveness of these programs can readily be seen throughout the Richmond communities. These programs can only be more effective if they are allowed to continue and allowed to expand and offer jobs and assistance to a greater number of people.

Thank you. That concludes my testimony.

The CHAIRMAN: All right, we will now have the presentation by Mr. Stephenson.

STATEMENT OF EDWIN P. STEPHENSON

Mr. STEPHENSON: Mr. Chairman, my name is Edwin P. Stephenson, and I am executive director of the North Richmond Neighborhood House.

I am here this morning to speak to you a little about this project.

For the past 13 years, I have been executive director of a social service agency called Neighborhood House. We are located in the ghetto community of North Richmond, a largely unincorporated area within the city of Richmond, Calif. As I understand it, the principal emphasis of this Committee is upon the investigation of various aspects of life within rural America. Life within North Richmond, albeit a northern industrial town, is, in a sense, life within a rural community. Such has not always been the case; but such factors as discrimination in housing, hiring, job training, and education have served to impart to this community a blighted character not unlike that of a small southern town.

These facts pose a paradox; for the residents of the community are essentially people who migrated from the South to California in search of a dream. It is in the same dream spoken of so movingly by Dr. Martin Luther King—a dream of hope, job, and fulfillment as human beings. On the other side of the coin is the reality—the "nightmare" spoken of so sardonically by Malcolm X. It is this vast contradiction between the dream and the reality to which I wish to address myself within this statement.

We are well aware that California is undergoing a period of "boom." People from all over the world, from all walks of life are, in the words of our chamber of commerce, "following the path to the sun." What motivates them? Why California? More specifically, what has brought hundreds of thousands of Negroes from rural areas of the South into the cities of California in less than 3 decades?

Undoubtedly, it has been the hope for an entirely new life which has prompted Negro men to leave the land and pack their families to California. Certainly, one of the most basic prerequisites to hope is the assurance of personal safety. It is no mistake to assert that the freedom which derives from a feeling of physical safety has been a chief factor in motivating Negroes to leave rural areas. It is not at all uncommon to hear even younger southern Negroes speak of the very real fear and terror of physical harm which was part and parcel of their daily life within the South. Northern Negroes can (and do) experience this fear, to an extent, in the form of police brutality. Nonetheless, police brutality tends to spur Negroes to action, while the southern lynch mob leads only to enervating demasculinization. Both results are deplorable you might say. Perhaps, but I do know that Negroes are overwhelmingly in favor of the former alternative.

Certainly a major aspect of the dream has been the hope for the kind of economic well-being which comes from secure, gainful employment. How much security does a sharecropper have? How well can a southern domestic worker support his family? Just how meaningful is the back-breaking toil which impoverished Negroes are forced to endure?

Such workers cannot help but regard California as a kind of promised land. Friends and relatives write home and describe the booming job situation in what seems to be glowing terms. In fact, the picture is indeed a rosy one. California has received more large defense contracts than any other State within the Union. Within the aircraft industry alone hundreds of new jobs are opened each year. Not to be overlooked is the State's booming population. Attendant upon this "population explosion" is the necessity to house, clothe, feed the new masses. Hence, new jobs are created. In addition to the great number of available jobs, the southern Negro is encouraged by the fact that fair employment practice laws have been enacted within the State. While these laws provide no guarantee against discriminatory hiring, they offer that small glimmer of hope which is all-essential.

Working counter to this hope are the hard realities which confront the rural newcomer who seeks employment. For the most part, he is an unskilled worker. As such, his chances of competing for well-paying jobs are severely diminished. In many such instances, the jobseeker is hindered from participation in such programs by the ever-constant fact of racial discrimination. As a rule, work-training programs, even in the large cities, are designed for whites. This has proven true especially of apprenticeship programs within the craft unions. Without this source of entry into the professional trades his chances of admittance are very slim. This fact holds truer now than perhaps 20 years ago. Then, entry into the trades was a looser, more informal thing. Even many Negroes found that all they needed was knowledge of a trade.

An additional factor which serves to make the employment picture a bleak one is a fact of which we are all cognizant. The majority of job placements result from informal contacts; i.e., from knowing people with "pull" and from knowing people who know exactly where the job openings are. It is doubtful that very many southern migrants ever have these kinds of contacts.

Assuming that the rural newcomer does secure employment through an industrial union, he must then contend with policies and seniority. If a decline hits the industry to the extent that there are cutbacks, you know who will be the first to be cut back.

Many of the dreams which people hold most dear are dreams for the well-being of their children. Negro parents (as well as all parents) wish to see to it that the lives of their children embody all of the good things which their own lives lacked. For Negro parents, this desire is perhaps more poignant; for there has been so much which they have been denied. Primary among these things was the lack of an opportunity to receive a decent education. Education for the Negro in rural areas of the South has always been poor, at the very best. Since Emancipation, generation after generation of Negro parents had no alternative but to send their children to segregated schools, obviously inferior. After all, why educate the blacks? They were good-for-nothing, and would always be that way. The longstanding denial of adequate education, combined with a burning desire for social improvement, served to create the high premium which Negroes place on education. Coupled with these factors is their knowledge that as second-class citizens they could never aspire to well-being.

Once again, California seemed a place wherein all problems would be solved. Were not the best public schools in America, California schools?

In California, their children would attend more and better schools—*unsegregated* schools. Not only that, but they as parents could more easily earn the money with which to send them. These are the dreams; what is the reality?

The academic situation for migrant Negroes is perhaps an even bleaker one than the employment situation. I say this because education is truly an investment in the future. When, for various reasons, the schools of a community fail to meet the needs of that community, the forecast can only be one of doom. Just to give you an idea of how some parents feel about the only school within North Richmond, I include a statement voiced by a member of our staff. When asked her opinion of the schools, she literally shouted, "The schools are the greatest single factor in the retardation of our kids! Instead of helping them get out of poverty, they're putting them more into it!" I included her statements because I know them to be representative. She feels the schools are doing more harm than good, and she has reason to believe it.

The administrators, the teachers, the textbooks themselves, are geared to the negation of the child's innate potential. Because so little is expected of him or offered him, he performs less and less well. For all intents and purposes, he goes to school in an integrated district (North Richmond is no exception to this). Chances are, however, that the school he attends will be a segregated one. Such a school enforces the pattern of poor education his parents were to accept.

It is an accepted fact that upon the completion of the sixth grade, a minority child from a ghetto school has a median reading level which is at least two grades lower than that of a comparable white student. This lag is compounded when the child enters an integrated high school because, at that point, he is placed in classes on the basis of his achievement up to then, rather than his ability. Such a situation leads, usually, to a drop in incentive and motivation. During this period, he is most apt to develop discouraged and hostile feelings toward the classes, the teachers—everything connected with school. At this point, he drops out. If he does remain in the "special" classes to which he has been assigned, he cannot help but fall further and further behind. If he goes on to graduate, the diploma he receives constitutes little more than a piece of paper. In most respects, he is hardly more "educated" than the dropout.

Without adequate education, he is virtually unemployable. Unable to become self-sufficient economically, he has lost the possibility of achieving the dream. In this instance, the dream has eluded him for the same basic reasons that it eluded his parents within the South. The stigma attached to the Negro race is a far-reaching one which extends even to the California paradise.

The need and desire for decent living conditions is certainly one of the chief motivating forces of Negro migration. The South, generally, has the poorest housing conditions in the country, and in it the Negro farmer is, in every respect, worse off than the white farmer. Small wonder that Negroes are attracted to the "big city" by photographs showing neat, clean houses, and by accounts from people who've already migrated.

This last source of information is an extremely important one. Letters written home and stories passed from one person to another have served as stimulus to countless numbers of Negroes who've packed up and left the South. Most of the Negroes I know who've come to California in the last several years have come partly because close relatives or friends had preceded them. Upon arrival, these friends or relatives either found them adequate housing and helped stake them to a beginning, or else invited the newcomers into their already overcrowded quarters and provided them with housing. If employment was not forthcoming, they provided the means for food and clothing during this interim.

If employment was not found, there was no resource to welfare due to the 1-year California residence requirement. Even after the passage of this year, if employment was insecure and unsettled (as it is for most unskilled workers in California), the newcomers found that the welfare allotment was too small to cover even the essentials of life. For instance, the monthly allowance for a family of four on Aid to Families with Dependent Children is $263. In most areas, an apartment suitable for four people cost approximately one-third of this allotment.

The dreams possessed by the Negro who leaves the South (which are not unlike those of all people who have moved to the "golden State" of California) become like the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow—it's elusive, and never seems to materialize. But he is living at a place and time when he is bombarded by images of affluent Americans who seem to have captured the dream. Television advertisements and promises by promoters of "$10 down and $10 a month credit" cause him to realize how alienated he is from America. He thus becomes disillusioned, bitter, and hostile.

America is a rich country. The county in which I work is possibly one of the wealthiest counties in the wealthiest State in the wealthiest nation in the world. Yet, we have pockets of extreme deprivation where, in 1960, 85 percent of our young men 18 to 21 years of age were not in school and unemployed; where the unemployment rate has hovered around 30 percent for a decade.

If America, with all of its wealth, cannot solve the problems of its dispossessed, I seriously question what we have to offer as a leader in a world where most people live in poverty.

In America, there is much discussion as to how to distribute (or redistribute) our wealth. If we are really concerned about the poor, we can alleviate their condition by giving them enough money to make it possible for them to live with a sense of dignity and security.

If giving people a welfare check is degrading them, then I would suggest that we give them an investment in America large enough so that the returns from the investment could sustain them at a standard of living comparable to that of more fortunate Americans.

If the above suggestion is unrealistic, then I would suggest that we seriously consider a guaranteed annual income, either by a reverse income tax or a family allowance. America can afford no less.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: We are grateful to you, Mr. Stephenson, and I know that these are the things that are concerning the members of the Commission as well as you.

We will open now for questions, but they must be very limited. First, I will recognize Mr. King.

Mr. KING: You made a statement which I would just like to have you say over again.

In one statement, you told the whole story, if I wrote it down correctly, and it was, "The opportunity to learn to get the wherewithal to buy into America." Is that what you said?

Mr. STEPHENSON: Yes, sir.

Mr. KING: I think that is a wonderful statement, and I think that told the whole story.

The CHAIRMAN: All right, Mr. Gibson.

Mr. GIBSON: How many unemployed persons do you have in your area?

Mr. STEPHENSON: Well, we have tried to get an idea of the number of males, unskilled, in west Contra Costa County, and we estimate the number to be in the neighborhood of 2,000 to 2,400. You know it is very difficult because you have to try to get some kind of figure from the Employment Service; however, many unemployed are not registered with the Employment Service. So, this was sort of a figure that they and we worked out together.

Mr. GIBSON: I see.

Mr. STEPHENSON: This is males only.

Mr. GIBSON: I understand. Does this include those who might be seeking other employment?

Mr. STEPHENSON: Oh, no, this is unemployed males only, completely unemployed.

And we are not talking about any kind of skilled people. These are unskilled. You know, there are always so many unemployed in terms of their skills.

Mr. GIBSON: Yes.

Mr. STEPHENSON: But we are not talking about any skilled persons. These are hard-core unemployed people.

Mr. GIBSON: In conjunction with your community interest, what is your voter registration percentage or figure in your area?

Mr. STEPHENSON: In North Richmond, which has a population of about 6,000, and in the last Presidential election, 90 percent of the eligible voters had registered; and, 89 percent of the registered voters actually went to the polls. This is one of the most active political communities, precincts, in the entire county except for possibly Kingston which is the high income area.

Mr. KING: Now, what does that mean in terms of the impact on local elections and so forth? How much of a voice does that give in the total political structure?

Mr. STEPHENSON: Enough so that both candidates for Congress actively campaigned in this community. They both expressed a very personal interest in this community. They came into this area personally to campaign.

The local city council has passed a resolution on the Jobs Creating project and sent it back to Congress, to their congressional Representatives, and to the Secretary of Labor asking that this program be continued.

Mr. GIBSON: What is the relationship of Neighborhood House to the community action agency?

Are you a part of the community action agency or is that an entirely different program?

Mr. STEPHENSON: We have a separate community action agency, and we have a contract with them so that we can help them. The things that are built into the Economic Opportunity Act are things that we, in one way or another, have attempted in a small way before the Economic Opportunity Act was ever passed.

Mr. GIBSON: Now, with regard to the community action agency in the Richmond area.

When this program was first formed, it seems that participation was solicited from the more prominent persons in the area, and when this happened, the common people sort of withdrew or they became passive, and I think this was because of lack of participation.

Has that been in any way the case in your area?

Mr. STEPHENSON: Yes and no. I think what is going to happen —well, let me put it this way.

We have a very peculiar setup and I do not think we need to go completely into it unless you wish me to.

For instance, the needy people said no, that they did not need the middle-class people running their programs. They got a lot of encouragement from some of us, and in electing the officers for the organization. We did not get any money from OEO and we set it up ourselves, and there are now 60 percent of the members of the advisory group of the council that are made up of COPE. However, in the whole time that we have been operating we have had very little trouble. We have had only one instance from the council to the board of supervisors where the board of supervisors did not respond positively; so that, in effect, this is the kind of influence this advisory council has had.

This one situation evolved around the legal aid program. There were a lot of political pressures involved.

Mr. GIBSON: Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: I will recognize Dr. Jackson.

Mrs. JACKSON: I was intrigued by what you said about North Richmond, but somehow when you put both of what was said by each of you together, you have two types of emotions, this positiveness on the part of the teenagers and then this negative reaction that comes through; and I find myself asking this question.

Where is that rooted? Is it the loss of money for supporting the positive programs that your youth have been carrying on; or just what is it?

Do either of you have a better way to describe it? Why will the youngsters of today work positively for the good of themselves and the community and then tomorrow they will run it down?

Do either of you have children?

Mr. **HAWKINS**: Well, I can tell you one thing, for instance. All of the people that are involved there in North Richmond are all poor people. There have been many problems in the elementary schools in the North Richmond area, and these schools are about 100 percent Negro. However, about 90 percent of the teachers there are Caucasion. There is no communication between the teachers and the parents of the community, so there is always a lack of understanding about particular problems in the schools.

Mrs. **JACKSON**: Do you live in that community?

Mr. **HAWKINS**: I do.

Mrs. **JACKSON**: Do you have children there in school?

Mr. **HAWKINS**: No, my youngsters are too young to go to school. But I am familiar with some of the problems. For instance, we have a school community worker who is assigned to that school and who comes from that community. This person usually knows the parents of the student and they are the bridge between the school and the community. In other words, they make home visits to the parents to talk to the parents about the child in the school, and then they in turn interpret the parents' feelings about the school to the school.

Now, this has worked fairly successfully in the North Richmond area.

Mrs. **JACKSON**: Thank you.

The **CHAIRMAN**: All right, Mr. Gallegos.

Mr. **GALLEGOS**: What kind of suggestions do you think the Federal Government ought to have with respect to the funding of these experimental demonstration programs? We realize these have been on the basis of 1 year or 18 months at the longest; so, what would be your suggestion with respect to guidelines for the Federal Government to follow?

Mr. **STEPHENSON**: I think the Federal Government is making the same mistake as many of the foundations have made. That is, they come in and make an experimental demonstration and somebody gets an opportunity to write a book on it or a pamphlet or a paper and then that paper or booklet or pamphlet is sent to the archives. That is the end of it. You see, it makes no appreciable impact.

What we need to do now is find out what it is we are doing with these demonstrations, and put into them what is needed. In other words, what is it we are really trying to change in the community by this demonstration and what do you do about that.

In fact, what we have already done is write to the Labor Department and request funds jointly from them with the other organizations. As far as we are concerned, the reason why we went into this in the first place is because the Employment Service was not doing the job with these hard-core unemployed people. If we cannot get the public agencies to do the job, we are out of business.

What we are saying is to let us work together, finance us jointly, and let's see if we can develop some of the methods and techniques which we have proven to be successful in a local one-horse-type operation, and we need to get this into an institutionalized program.

Mr. **GALLEGOS**: Thank you.

The **CHAIRMAN**: Gentlemen, we are just simply running out of time and we are going to have to move on.

I am sorry, but we just must complete our program by 3 o'clock this afternoon, because we have a field trip planned.

I know that I express the sentiment of this Commission, that we are very grateful to you for the information that you have given us and also we are grateful to Mr. Hawkins for his presentation. These are the things we want to hear about, particularly with the eloquence with which both of you have expressed yourselves this afternoon.

Thank you so much.

Mr. STEPHENSON: Thank you.

Mr. HAWKINS: Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: You each have left copies of your statement for the record, have you not?

Mr. STEPHENSON: Yes, we have left copies of our statements.

The CHAIRMAN: All right, the Commission will recognize Mrs. Ella Rumley, social science analyst, Applied Health Research Center, working with the off-reservation Indians.

Mrs. Rumley, just as a beginning here, where are you from?

Mrs. RUMLEY: I am from Tucson, Ariz.

The CHAIRMAN: We will welcome now a statement from you on a summary basis, and the record will reflect your full prepared statement; and in that way, we will have an opportunity to question you with reference to some of the statements you will make.

We will appreciate it.

Now, you may proceed.

STATEMENT OF ELLA G. RUMLEY

Mrs. RUMLEY: Mr. Chairman, and honorable members of this Commission, I am Ella G. Rumley; I am a social science analyst, Operation SAM, Applied Indian Health Research Center, Division of Indian Health, USPHS.

I have come here this morning to speak to you about the Indian problems in urban communities.

While I have recently joined the U. S. Public Health Service's Division of Indian Health, I was invited to speak to this committee while an employee of the University of Arizona.

I am pleased to present my views of Indian problems in urban communities as a member of the Tucson Indian Center and as a private citizen.

There is a constant movement of families to and from the reservation. Of the 388 families enumerated in a population register in Tucson, about one-third have already left the area. But it is quite probable that replacement has already taken place by migrating families. This high rate of mobility tends to create special problems and situations unique to Indians, which affect his status as a citizen. His shift between a ward of the Government and being an independent citizen of the United States causes confusion and frustration when seeking needed services for the welfare of his family.

Since off-reservation Indians are not allowed to participate in the reservation community action programs, and the city's OEO programs are dominated by well-organized groups and powerful political structure, the off-reservation Indian is neglected despite his special problems.

There are many reasons why an Indian leaves the security of his reservation, but the main reason is in search for employment. This, then, becomes the source of his problems. With this constant movement they face the problems of interrupted education which sets a child back in progress. Even if the child has taken advantage of the Headstart program on the reservation, he can be out of school 2 years when he moves off the reservation so that what experiences he has had are forgotten.

The cost of education is an obstacle since the wage earner is unskilled. In one farm area, the ranchers did not want their workers to participate in the migrant opportunity programs.

An unfortunate number of the Indians are in poor health, as compared to the non-Indian population, because they cannot afford private care. They have great difficulty in securing transportation to the PHS Indian Hospital and often do not qualify for the county hospital, even though they may be living in a shack. Most county hospitals would rather send their Indian patients to the PHS Indian Hospital. This seems to be true in other counties besides in Pima County where it was a common practice to refer Indians to San Xavier. At the present time, the Indians from off-reservations areas adjacent to Tucson are treated at the clinic at San Xavier; but Government policies, relative to qualifications for care, can be interpreted in many ways. Many officials take the position that an Indian is an Indian and is entitled to full medical services. Others would limit governmental services to the on-reservation Indian. This is confusing to the patient and too often he would rather seek a medicine man since he is at least familiar with the proceedings of the medicine man's rituals.

Some problems pertain to both the off-reservation Indian and the reservation Indian who is in the city. An Indian is arrested if he has a drink; the other races are not that closely observed. One couple who had not been in town a half hour were arrested for being drunk because they were observed taking a drink.

They had to pay $10 apiece just to get out of jail and back home since their shopping money was spent on fines. Merchants unload their junk on Indians. They sell them inferior goods, particularly cars that break down as soon as they get them home.

There is a definite lack of knowledge about how to exist in an Anglo society. Often they need help in getting welfare assistance. Lack of communication is a great problem. One old man of 84 years in Maricopa is picking cotton as much as his age and health permits. No one has told him of the welfare old age assistance.

The people in the cities feel that the Indians are not their problem, they belong to the U.S. Government. One area council worker told representatives of the Tucson Indian Center not to expect anything from their program because the U.S. Government has not been able to help the Indians in all the years they have been working with them.

Indians need leadership training geared to the Indian people's needs. The two leadership training classes which were available to some of the Indians have not met the needs of the Indians in the city. One program enlightened leaders on the facilities of the city, and the other program used the Air Force Manual on leadership which is completely out of our scope.

There is a need for assistance centers for Indians off the reservation so that eventually they can be brought into the larger society. We need centers where we can get security and support while making the transition between reservation and off-reservation living. These centers need the support and money of the Federal Government.

Off-reservation Indians should be assisted by the Government when in nearby communities when they are assisted only in relocation projects. It is logical that reservation Indians should move to the nearest city for employment where they can retain ties with the reservation.

When the Tucson Indian Center proposal was submitted through the city's OEO program, it became very apparent that a major obstacle was the established political structure in the city. That, for example, programs for the poor have been going on along certain channels—through Tucson community agencies—so that a group not in this channel has a hard time. It becomes a case of "he who has gets more, and he who doesn't have gets none."

Assistance centers, providing help for Indians who voluntarily relocate in urban areas adjacent to the reservation, should be helped by the Federal Government with the assistance of off-reservation Indians and city officials. Participation by the cities is very important to overcome the apathy on the part of local administrators toward local Indian problems.

Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN: Mrs. Rumley, we will now open for questions here.

First, I will recognize Mr. Woodenlegs.

Mr. WOODENLEGS: These are off-reservation Indians; you are not enrolled on any reservation, is this right?

Mrs. RUMLEY: Well, there are many types here. Most of them are enrolled on their own reservation rolls.

Mr. WOODENLEGS: Whatever programs that reservation has, you cannot get in on those programs?

Mrs. RUMLEY: That is right. Let's take the Papago, for instance.

Over half of the people here in this city are from the Papago Reservation, the Indian people.

We tried at the beginning to get in on their OEO program. After we submitted our ideas and helped plan their program, we were told that we were not eligible to participate. So, we decided to go on the city's program, since we are Tucson citizens.

Mr. WOODENLEGS: It seems like on these reservation programs, if you are enrolled there, you can take part in the programs.

Mrs. RUMLEY: Apparently that is not how the thing is worked.

Mr. WOODENLEGS: But if you are enrolled and a member of that tribe and they have these programs, then you should go on their programs.

We have tribes in Montana, seven different tribes. Even if they are off the reservation, if they are enrolled, they are entitled to any programs.

They have one group there that we call the landless Indians. They are in Great Falls and they are landless Indians.

Mrs. RUMLEY: Incidentally, there is a mistake on the agenda program because it speaks of nonreservation Indians and we are talking about off-reservation Indians. I do speak for the off-reservation Indians. There is a difference.

Mr. WOODENLEGS: They are still entitled to the programs, to participate in programs, as long as they are enrolled.

Mrs. RUMLEY: Individually, but not as a group. They can't come to the city and give us money, I guess.

The CHAIRMAN: I think I put on the agenda off-reservation instead of nonreservation Indians, I believe I made that correction.

Mrs. RUMLEY: Yes, that is the way it should be.

The CHAIRMAN: That is more accurate and more descriptive of the work you are doing now, is that right?

Mrs. RUMLEY: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: That is the work you are doing now?

Mrs. RUMLEY: That is right.

The CHAIRMAN: And you are a social science analyst?

Mrs. RUMLEY: I am doing this as a member of the American Indian Association of Tucson.

The CHAIRMAN: I see.

We certainly do want to thank you for making your presentation, we appreciate it very much.

Mr. ROESSEL: Let me just clear up one final thing here. There was one thing I would like to clear up that Mr. Woodenlegs asked you about.

If you were living on the Papago reservation, you would be eligible for the community action programs.

The reason that you are not eligible is not because—well, it is because you are not living on the reservation, is that not correct?

Mrs. RUMLEY: I guess so.

Mr. ROESSEL: Because, if you were on the reservation, your children could take part in the Headstart and other programs; but the point is, there is no Headstart in Tucson which is sponsored by the Papago Indian Tribe.

Mrs. RUMLEY: Yes.

Mr. WOODENLEGS: The President of the United States put it on the agenda to try to help Indians.

Mrs. RUMLEY: I wish they would try to help me.

Mr. WOODENLEGS: They are going to help the Indians; I know they will.

Mrs. RUMLEY: Well, there are also Indians on the reservation. Anything that goes to the Indians goes through the Indian Reservation, and it goes to the Indians on the reservation.

The CHAIRMAN: Well, we are just going to have to put some of these questions on the agenda of unfinished business; we have run out of time.

We, as I say, are very grateful to you for the information you have provided this Commission with. Your statement has been taken down as you have given it orally, and it will appear in the transcript.

Thank you very much, we appreciate your being here.

Mrs. RUMLEY: Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, we will recognize Jorge Acevedo, deputy director, OEO, Santa Clara County, San Jose, Calif., and he will speak on "Rural Area Community Action."

STATEMENT OF JORGE ACEVEDO

Mr. ACEVEDO: Honorable members of the National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty, I am happy to be here today.

I am deputy director of the Economic Opportunity Commission of Santa Clara County, Inc., with the central office in San Jose, Calif.

I wish to speak to three elements in the agenda of rural poverty: (1) an attempt to define the concept of poverty; (2) a suggested solution to rural poverty; and (3) a plan of action to come from the proceedings of this Commission.

Poverty involves people. Poverty involves the total family: the man, the woman, and the children. Poverty may involve individuals. Poverty may also involve a community. Then the community becomes a ghetto.

Poverty is not measured in terms of units in computers. Poverty is the life in reality; the despair of the hopeless.

Poverty in the Southwest signals the Mexican American. In the eastern coast, the Puerto Rican, the Cuban, the Negro may be the warp and woof of poverty. It is not reasonable to compare the eastern coast with the Southwest, nor the representative ethnic minorities with that of the Mexican American in the Southwest.

Poverty is more than economic; it is also cultural, very emotional, and also political.

The effective land is being swallowed by incoming settlement. The trend toward urbanization empties the farmland, and the tide of Negro movement merging with the new American Indian aspiration makes for conflict as a broad-based working people fight with each other for the lowest rung in the economic ladder.

The Mexican American has not yet learned to riot to articulate a given need. Political effectiveness is preferable to us in a measured cooperative growth and development. The Government does not know the Southwest or the Mexican American. The pressure of numbers is our only answer, as yet, to lack of recognition.

In an analysis of poverty, the entire Southwest should be treated as a region rather than compartmentalized by States. The ferment or mobility makes the area indigenous to the harvesting seasons. Causal factors are not geographical, but are national issues which become understandable only from the viewpoint of a common boundary.

Any improvements program should be multidisciplined. Not one single item may be isolated. Elements fuse into each other and become a festering wound. The circle of cause and effect is inclusive rather than exclusive. Poverty is all-encompassing.

A priority list of needs includes unionization. To the rural Mexican-American worker this movement is not a concession but a right. New careers in a comprehensive contest make more sense than social welfare dependency or training for non-existent menial token jobs. Children developmental centers for an extended day care program cut the circuit of poverty and engender hope in aspiration. Recreational, tutorial, leisure-time teen posts for the disadvantaged forgotten rural youth is only one answer in compensation for public school inadequacy and local school board shortsightedness. Family education in health and consumer experience is one answer to prevention techniques and fraud and budgeting problems.

I invite this honorable Commission to join with the Mexican American in the Southwest to affirm the imperative need of a series of regional Mexican-American conferences prior to any White House Conference on the Mexican American.

The Mexican American in the Southwest would join in affirming the need for a White House Conference on the Mexican American.

Secondly, the Mexican American would affirm the need for local representation in the advisory committee to preplan such a conference, as well as the privilege to participate in the agenda.

Poverty is emotional. Poverty is rooted in the history of generations. Poverty is engrained in the experience of people.

Poverty is also political. The desperation of poverty answers only to concrete and practical action. One proposal is a White House Conference on the Mexican American in the Southwest—on our terms.

I wish to add a few statements or remarks to my prepared statement.

The total population of Santa Clara County is about 1 million. The Mexican-American population numbers under 150,000.

The Economic Opportunity Commission administers annually about $5 million in total earmarked and unearmarked programs.

The County of Santa Clara is an excellent example of social impact now affecting the Mexican American in the greater Southwest.

My comments to you today are based on the Santa Clara County situation, but in the context of the Mexican American in the Southwest concept.

My testimony is in terms of ideas and concepts relating to the Mexican American in the Southwest. The UCLA Mexican-American Study Project, the Michigan University Migrant Mobility Study, men like Ernesto Galarza, Julian Sarnora, Arthro Campa, Arthro Cabrera, Gorge Sanchez, Julian Nova, and others are documenting action research in terms of computer elements. I choose then to speak in principles based on existing scholarship.

I wish to speak to three elements in the agenda of rural poverty: an attempt to understand the concept of poverty; suggested solutions to poverty; and a plan of action to come from the proceedings of this Commission.

Poverty must be understood in terms of people, not cybernetics formulae. Poverty involves people. Poverty involves the total family: the man, the woman, the children. Poverty drowns and suffocates individuals. Poverty may also affect a community. Then the growth becomes a slum situation.

Poverty in the Southwest signals the Mexican American agribusiness related worker. To speak about poverty in the Southwest is to articulate the hopeless despair of the Mexican American indentured to the profit motive of the agriculturally related corporation in the Southwest.

In the eastern coast, the Puerto Rican, the Cuban, the Negro may be the warp and woof of poverty. The conditions and factors in the eastern coast are not parallel to those in the Southwest. The Mexican American in the Southwest is a different entity from the Puerto Rican, the Cuban, the American Indian, and the American Negro.

Population mobility westward, the pressures of increased population, family social pathology, the comparative youthfulness of the family, and the premise of poverty transmission from the parent generation to that of the children, are essential poverty factors to the Mexican American in the Southwest.

Urbanization and the movement of darker people to the industrial and service core, coupled with the withdrawal of the Anglo to the suburbs is a problematic constellation in its own right.

The subsequent status of the woman in the family complex, the fertility of the Mexican American woman to age 49, the failure of Catholic dogma to delineate planned parenthood and close its eyes to the abortion rate, and the authoritarian male function are causative factors in Mexican American poverty.

The competition for decreasing jobs in the wake of machine robots, the coming open conflict between Negro, Asiatic, American Indian, and Mexican American in scrambling for unavailable jobs in nontrained levels is a promise for social ferment and the implication of deliberate economic poverty.

Poverty is more than economic. It is also cultural, very emotional, and also political. The withdrawing of love and attention in a poverty existence generates hopelessness, inadequacy, and despair. Such frustration explodes in violence and revolution.

The Mexican American has not yet used the riot to articulate a given need. Office of Economic Opportunity measures are not solving poverty, but are postponing the inevitable revolution. The Economic Opportunity Act is emasculated for the Mexican American to the degree that funds are directed on a policy level from community action unearmarked programs to those which are canned and earmarked. Political effectiveness is preferable to the Mexican American in a measured cooperative growth and development. The pressure of mute numbers is our only answer, as yet, to lack of recognition and awareness.

Some suggested solutions to the poverty of the southwestern Mexican American are now in order. Washington, as a Federal political entity is ignorant of the Southwest and of the Mexican American. An open-ended, two-way communication must be established immediately.

The entire Southwest should be treated as a region rather than compartmentalized by States or combinations of more than one State.

Any corrective and poverty prevention program must be multidisciplined. Not one single item may be isolated for treatment since poverty has many roots and all are related. The circle of cause and effect is inclusive rather than exclusive. A county housing authority is most basic to corrective measures, yet not less important than a regional manpower careers plan, a regional development economic program based on common market and alliance for progress concepts, health and planned parenthood clinics, or a consumer, home economic education project. Poverty is all-encompassing.

One basic solution for the Mexican American is that of participation with agency and community establishments to eradicate causal poverty elements. The Mexican American wants to be considered in the planning, policy decision, and implementation of antipoverty measures. The Mexican American wishes to be recognized and included in any agenda which involves his community and destiny.

A priority list of solutions to southwestern poverty conditions would include:

Unionization of farm-related workers. This process is not a concession of privilege but a right. Unionization should be self-disciplined to avoid interterritorial disputes and duplication of effort. Cooperation and not open competition in terms of recruitment and contractual agreements would tend to right and solidify the Mexican-American community.

A second concept is one of new careers, public service oriented manpower programing. All segments of the community should be involved and integrated into this single-minded priority effort.

Children developmental centers for extended day care are community, family-related action levers. The total family is involved in the growth and development educational phases. The father male figure in a new role may be less threatening. Such centers should not be another means of freeing the women for further exploitation as a labor pool. There is little leisure in poverty. Husband and wife concepts are played in terms of conquest and desire, not mutual satisfaction and need.

The youth is the forgotten age. Recreational, tutorial, leisure-time teen posts are most necessary for wholesome contacts.

Basic education and basic skills, interwoven with family education is causally essential.

What then is the call for action from the proceedings of the Commission on Rural Poverty!

National political issues should be considered and not hidden in any dimensional treatment of southwestern Mexican-American poverty.

The Commission should support Mexican-American desires for a country which lives in peace rather than with militarism, economic colonialism, and open war. We subscribe to ultra-national citizenship and the government based in United Nations.

Economic welfare measures borrowed from the best of communal-minded socialist systems, which are already experimenting with poverty and overpopulation pressures, underconsumption of grain, importation of grain food in the face of cosmic starvation, should be recommended for trial here.

Legislation in behalf of the Mexican American in the Southwest is long overdue. Lyndon Baines Johnson has been associated with Texas politics for about 30 years, but the Mexican American in Texas is not yet represented in terms of legislation reflecting need.

The Mexican American in terms of population ratio is not represented in the Southwest either in terms of State or National levels. We have, as yet, only token representation.

The Mexican-American efforts toward political involvement have been disastrous. We have been had in local partisan activity, then in county and State elections and measures, and now in our relation with the sophistication of Federal and National politics.

Through VISTA, 20 annual fellowships should be accorded Mexican-American college students to the five representative southwestern State universities. These fellowships would include full tuition, home grants, board and room, some consumable supply and petty cash fund, and a termination allowance.

During the summers of the 4-year tour in college, these 100 students should be community aids in Washington agencies for the first 2 years, then serve in their indigenous communities for the last 2 summers in self-planned projects with relation to their home agency.

I propose, also an additional 100 annual fellowships to Washington agencies for Mexican-American opinion leaders with experience factors as measured components rather than educational attainment. These people would be exposed to Federal expertise in both training and function.

Each year at 6-month intervals small groups (25) of southwestern Mexican-American opinion leaders selected by their community organizations should meet to communicate in terms of the Southwest, consider and implement strategy, and recommend political measures.

The Mexican American in the Southwest demands a White House Conference. Such a Conference could be celebrated each 5 years. During the intervening 4 years the conference could be celebrated in each of the Southwestern States on a rotation basis.

I invite this honorable Commission to join with the Mexican American in the Southwest to affirm the imperative need of a series of regional Mexican-American conferences prior to any White House Conference on the Mexican American.

A basic concept of the Economic Opportunity Act as operationally projected is that of bringing services to the people. Another corollary measure is that one which uses indigenous resources and capability in self-help measures.

The Mexican American would join in affirming the need for a White House Conference on the Mexican American.

Secondly, the Mexican American would affirm the need for local representation in the advisory committee to preplan such a Conference, or regional conferences, as well as the inalienable right to participate in the agenda.

Poverty is emotional and cultural. Poverty is rooted in the history of generations.

Poverty is also political. The coalition of effective political ethnic minorities is only one more suggested measure to the indigenous leadership. The desperation of poverty answers only to concrete and practical action. One proposal is a legislative action White House Conference on the Mexican American in the Southwest—on our terms.

Mr. HENDERSON: Thank you very much, Mr. Acevedo. The Chairman is having lunch right now so I am trying to fill in for him.

We do really appreciate your presentation.

I assume you have made your remarks available for the record?

Mr. ACEVEDO: Yes, that is correct.

Mr. HENDERSON: Now, we are going to have to stop at 3 o'clock. We have only a little over an hour and we still have five people to hear from, so I suggest that the Commission, in regard to questions, govern themselves accordingly.

I will recognize Mr. Gallegos.

Mr. GALLEGOS: I would like your comments on these subjects, No. 1, draft board; No. 2, juries; and No. 3, Federal employment.

Could you just enlarge on those for us, please?

Mr. ACEVEDO: Thank you very much. If you will remind me of each of these in order, I will attempt to comment on them.

No. 1, I believe very firmly that the Mexican Americans are not represented on any of the draft boards in any way throughout the Southwest, particularly in Santa Clara County I know that is true.

The Mexican-American youngster is a dropout in most cases and is not a college student; and also, in terms of rural existence, he is more open to selection by the draft boards.

All of these factors mean that the Mexican American is overrepresented in the armed services of his country.

Now, your second subject, Mr. Gallegos?

Mr. GALLEGOS: In terms of juries, jury service by the Mexican Americans.

Mr. ACEVEDO: In terms of juries, the Mexican Americans are slighted. He has not the privilege of becoming acquainted and becoming familiar with court procedure for the reason that his name is overlooked and ignored.

If there is one overall criticism of the Mexican Americans to the community in general, it is that of discrimination by omission. He is not discriminated against as directly and fundamentally as the Negroes, but the discrimination of the Mexican American is more indirect and more subtle and more through omission.

Thirdly, in terms of Federal employment, the Mexican American is only now beginning to be representative of the southwestern community in Federal employment. This is only true in terms of a very small handful of people.

In my own experience in the last 15 years, we could count leaders in the Mexican-American communities on one hand. Today, we can use two hands; but still, in terms of a national level, we dare not speak in terms of more than a half dozen effective leaders as yet.

This is the reason then for the fact that we must become acquainted and communicate with the Federal Government as a political entity.

Mr. GALLEGOS: How about the Upward Bound program?

Mr. ACEVEDO: The Upward Bound programing and effectiveness in terms of job developments in Santa Clara County—NYC—all of these are factors that would involve the migrant Mexican American.

The Mexican American as a migrant is deliberately excluded from critical culturations, assimilation, in terms of economic sufficiency.

Even the Mexican American, in his vertical aspirations, insists that the lower based migrant is too much of a load, and a yoke, around his neck.

Even the Mexican-American community is prone to do this and to say this, and since they are, then it is even truer of the larger community in terms of what is possible in outreach to make this ascension possible.

Mr. HENDERSON: We have time for one more question.

I will recognize Mr. Gibson.

Mr. GIBSON: I was interested in getting some qualification in terms of references you made to the mechanisms in getting political leadership involvement by the Mexican American.

Am I right in understanding that you feel that a lead in this can be played by Washington as a mechanism for getting increased contact between Mexican-American leaders—do you feel that the lead should come from Washington in terms of regionally sponsored conferences annually, and every 5 years, a Washington conference?

Mr. ACEVEDO: This is correct essentially.

I would press for a White House Conference every 5 years. Then, on a regional basis, on a yearly level, on a rotating basis in each of the Southwestern States.

Mr. GIBSON: Did I understand you to say that this would develop leadership in the Mexican-American community, and that would be the prime objective of holding these conferences?

Mr. ACEVEDO: That is true; the one objective is the development of leadership. The other one would be that of the continued pressure from both the community and Washington on antipoverty measures.

Mr. GIBSON: You made reference to two things, and one is the coming conflict—interminority group conflict—between the various disadvantaged minorities in the country, over sharing the very limited resources to work on the problems which they share. That is, in terms of the fact that they must conflict with each other, with the limited number of things available to them, and therefore create this interconflict, this conflict as to who gets which portion.

You also said that there was a need to find a mechanism for a coalition, and I presume that this is based on the fact that this would provide a broad base for getting more physical muscle focused on the needs, the shared needs, of these people.

Mr. ACEVEDO: Certainly, I am in favor of ethnic cooperative measures rather than direct conflict. I believe that only in direct ratio to the understanding of the ethnic leaders in this direction will this open conflict be avoided.

Mr. GIBSON: Now, in these two things—and they are related in my mind—in these two things, I am wondering if you are speaking to the Mexican-American community, or if you are speaking to the Federal Government in a sense?

Mr. ACEVEDO: Both, because only if the Federal Government understands the situation of the Mexican American in the Southwest can they then deal intelligently with any kind of reforms.

Mr. HENDERSON: We appreciate very much your presentation of testimony and certainly the elaboration that you have given us will be of assistance to us.

We thank you for your interest.

Mr. ACEVEDO: I wish to thank the Commission very much, and good afternoon to you.

Mr. HENDERSON: We will now recognize Dr. Arthur Campa, sociologist, Denver University, from Denver, Colo., and he will speak on the Mexican-American rural life.

Now, Dr. Campa, we would appreciate your giving us a summary and at this point in the record, we will place the entire text of your prepared statement.

We do need to have a few minutes for questions.

So, you may proceed at this time.

STATEMENT OF ARTHUR L. CAMPA

Mr. CAMPA: I am Arthur L. Campa and I will speak on "The Urban Poor in the Southwest."

Poverty has been the concern of this country since the Nation came into being—it is part of the civic responsibility and mutual assistance philosophy of a Nation that places a high premium on collective effort. No other country has shown comparable interest in the plight of the underprivileged, and certainly no other country has allocated the amount of funds which have been lately set aside to improve the status of those who by our standards of living are called poor. Today's poor are no poorer, perhaps even less so, than they were 40 to 50 years ago, but they have become more aware of their disproportionate share of the goods and benefits enjoyed by their prosperous neighbors. Their needs stem to some extent, not from what they lack as from what their neighbors have.

As we look into the problems of these less fortunate citizens, we encounter dimensions that complicate the remedial measures undertaken to improve the condition of the poor whether urban or rural. The Puerto Ricans in New York, the Negroes, the inhabitants of Appalachia and the Spanish speakers of the Southwest present varying conditions which must be considered separately in order to initiate an effective program of rehabilitation. Some are urban dwellers; others live in small rural communities; and still others, about ¼ million in the Southwest, consist of migrants who travel all over the country in search of employment.

A number of studies have been made of the poverty that afflicts the larger centers of population by noted sociologists, economists, and anthropologists. We have readily available data regarding the nature of poverty and what it does to people living in Harlem and in the poorer sections of the southern uplands. These field studies reveal that there are an estimated 50 million persons who by present standards of living are considered poor. Leon Keyserling tells us that a family with an income below $3,000 is deprived of goods and services essential to adequate living. In the Southwest, this figure can be lowered considerably in many instances of rural poverty. As a general rule, it is the rural population here and elsewhere that falls into the lowest brackets of poverty. In addition to having a less-than-adequate income, they live in a social and economic structure where the risk of poverty is much greater, and where upward mobility is slowest. Recent studies conducted by Oscar Ornati show that the incidence of poverty drops significantly in cities with a population of over a million.

As we look at the region of our prime concern today, the Southwest, we find several distinct groups such as Indians, Anglos, and Spanish speakers. Each group has a different composition, a different history, and even a different language. The only thing they have in common is that they are poor and that they are American citizens. Except for those who live in the widely separated centers of population, the majority of the Spanish poor can be considered rural, and if we look closely at those who live in the periphery of the larger cities, we will find that they come from a traditional folk culture which can be considered a subculture because they have never been wholly integrated into American culture and are not a product of a complete Spanish society. To all intents and purposes, they, too, may be considered rural because they have not acquired the value system of urban society and still guide themselves by familial rather than by institutional relationship.

The Spanish-speaking rural poor poses a number of problems not found in the English-speaking group whether white or Negro. In order to participate effectively in the various projects of the OEO, they must learn to communicate and express themselves in English, or those directing the program must learn Spanish. But aside from the problem of communication, the conditions that bring about the low economic status of the rural Spanish-speaking poor may be divided into three groups at least.

First there are a number of small landholders whose meager holdings cannot provide an adequate living for their families throughout the year. They augment their income by working for the State or county, by hiring out to big ranchers at various seasons of the year, or by working in the nearby cities and towns. Eventually some of these rural-based part-time farmers and seasonal workers manage to move into the city where they can send their children to school and where they can have access to urban facilities. The transition from the country to the city is a gradual process of adjustment that can be achieved only when the head of the family can have steady employment. The city, however, demands additional skills which the rural folk do not possess, and furthermore no contributions in kind may be obtained, like in the country; everything must be paid for in cash. Oftentimes these new demands place a greater burden on these turned-urban dwellers than on the urban poor who have learned to live over the years in conditions that can be very oppressive to the rural arrivals.

A second group is composed of families who live in small rural communities whose income is derived wholly from subsistence farming. They do not cultivate their land with power machinery; first, because they cannot afford to buy mechanized equipment and, secondly, because their small acreage would make it uneconomical. Their housing is poor, their stock is run down, and their crop yield is far below what it could be with more scientific farming practices. They could be raised from marginal living if they would rotate their crops, plant the right seed, raise the kind of stock that can produce more with less consumption, and observe marketing practices that would give them a greater yield. Theirs is a practical problem which needs to be solved with a nuts-and-bolts approach rather than with economic theories and temporary relief programs.

The third group consists of landless families whose living is derived from seasonal crops from Texas to California as far north as Oregon, and throughout the Middle West. Some are intrastate farm laborers, particularly in California, but those living in Texas travel out of the State, where wages are higher and where benefits are much improved. There is a certain amount of adventure in these workers who are willing to fan out thousands of miles from home in order to earn a better living. Although their life away from home base is largely rural, they see a good deal of country and sights that those who stay home never can afford to see. One of the great problems of these migrant workers is obtaining proper schooling for their children. They do not stay in one place long enough for the children to be advanced from one grade to another. Moreover, since children are potential wage earners, they are kept away from school in order to work.

There have been some changes in the movement of migrants as a result of the termination of the bracero program. In Colorado, for example, intrastate migrant labor reached its peak in 1957 but by 1965 it dropped 42 percent. According to present estimates, this migrant labor should decline to zero by 1972. On the other hand, the interstate migrant labor force has increased 57 percent as a result of the bracero contract termination, and as the intrastate diminishes the interstate laborers increase, although not at the same rate as before, because much of the work on large farms is becoming mechanized. This is particularly true of the sugar beet industry. Eventually these unemployable farmworkers will have to find a different source of income, but unless they have more skills they will join the ranks of the unemployed.

This landless army of migrant farmworkers is so mobile that States have not been able to develop an effective school program for their children. Movable schoolrooms, teaching teams, and other plans have been tried, but they have not been very satisfactory because the migrants move so often from place to place and sometimes in opposite directions within the same stream. It is not practical to settle them in any one region where their services are needed because their employment is seasonal and it would become virtually impossible for them to earn a livelihood with the seasonal employment provided in any one location. And so they are on the move from April to the middle of November and back at their home base in Texas where most of them come from.

Another problem of migrants is that they do not establish themselves in any one State to become eligible for public welfare services, and the limited facilities of migrant camps do not provide health and medical care to attend the thousands of cases incident to their substandard living. The result is that some migrant workers extend in some cases into the third generation before they break the vicious circle of birth, growth, and decay within the same low economic status.

The Spanish-speaking poor in the Southwest and on the west coast have a number of characteristics in common with the urban poor in cities like Chicago and New York. They react today to their marginal position, but their reaction differs in degree and in kind. The subculture in which they exist holds a potential for protest against the existing status quo by aligning themselves with political movements that they believe will bring redress or improvement. The current emphasis on civil rights awakens many to the realization that they can have a voice in the affairs of their respective communities. They are not too successful in consolidating their gains because they lack experience and training in handling their own affairs successfully. But it is evident that they are breaking away from the fatalistic acceptance of their plight and are rising to the plane of hopeful expectations.

Despite the similarities that all poor people have in common, it would be fateful to assume that the problems of the Spanish-speaking poor, urban or rural, can be handled in the same manner as all the others. First and foremost, they are not the product of the usual, ordinary American society, but a folk culture rooted in a Mexican and Spanish past antedating the arrival of Anglo-American culture. Moreover, this variance was accentuated over the past century and a half by apathy, discrimination, and considerable prejudice on the part of the dominant culture. We must face the fact that even the provisions of treaties after 1848 were honored more in the breach than in the observance. The Spanish-speaking poor never acquired an identity with this superimposed culture and thus are lacking the continuity of traditions that enables others, though poor, to participate in the life of the country where they live. In a sense the Spanish poor have become displaced persons. And yet, these Hispanos do not feel alien altogether, although they may feel like outsiders looking into American life, because they are surrounded by evidences of a Spanish past all around them that helps them to maintain their own cultural identity. Their Spanish language, customs, food, celebrations, religious observances, and philosophy of life are still strong bonds difficult to break.

In many ways the Spanish-speaking poor feel that their rights have been usurped, and lately with the impetus given by the civil rights movement, many groups from Colorado to California have become openly provocative and even activistic. They march on State capitols in quest of redress for what they consider illegal appropriation of the land rights; to a governor's mansion seeking equitable wage scales, and organize peaceful marches against fruit growers whose wages they insist are below the going rates. Happily, their traditional culture provides a restraint not often found in other groups in the same region. The helplessness and resignation so much in evidence a generation or two ago among the rural workers has given way to militant action and has culminated in social and political organizations that 20 years ago were not in the cultural spectrum of the Hispanos. The colonial indoctrination, that it was virtuous to be poor and that humility and resignation would earn for them the kingdom of heaven, is no longer convincing to people who aspire to be more than marginal participants in an affluent society.

There is a better chance today for the Spanish-speaking poor to break the bonds of the culture of poverty which constitutes the greater proportion of the Spanish-speaking working classes. They must become acculturated in an urban way of life. It also means that they must adopt to some extent a value system through which they can more readily attain their objectives. This doesn't mean that the Hispanos will lose their identity nor that they must discard folkways and attitudes that are conducive to happy living. The American way of life is constantly being enriched by contributions from cultures outside the realm of English traditions. This means, however, that the Hispanos will have to take stock of their own traditional culture in order to make a better selection of what they must preserve. The transition will be gradual, and much of it can be made possible through the poverty program providing it is well implemented. It must not become just another dole or welfare check, else the contribution of the OEO will be meaningless pump priming.

The disclosure that there are 40 to 50 million poor people living in the cities and in rural areas at a time when we are experiencing the highest prosperity in history comes as a shocking revelation to many of us. A disproportionate number of these disadvantaged people are found, as we have seen, living in rural communities or working away from home as migrants. The majority of these migrants or farmworkers are Spanish speakers whose living design has been a nomadic existence in search of employment. Rather than a problem per se, they are a national responsibility which the Federal Government has assumed through the OEO program. The poverty of these rural people is not the result of collective poverty such as emerged from the depression of the thirties. It is group poverty, that is, the impoverished condition of a segment of the population that has traditionally earned subsistence level wages due to lack of more remunerative skills on their part, and a complex of fortuitous and deliberately caused circumstances above which they have been unable to rise.

A very small number of the most aggressive individuals coming from this rural culture have been able to rise above this heritage, but virtually all of them continue to live poorly housed, ill clothed, and with only the very basic elements of education. Migration to the city does not solve their problems; in fact, it aggravates them in most cases because they are ill prepared to cope with urban life. They simply add to the already outsized forces of unemployed unskilled workers in the slum areas. The problem lies in that these groups, whether migrants on the road, or in rural communities, do not progress in proportion to their increasing large families because their children cannot or do not receive the education and training necessary in today's automated economy. An increasing number become unemployable as they are replaced by mechanized agriculture. Obviously, a speedier program of rehabilitation is sorely needed. Also they are held back in the face of a rising inflation because there is a tendency in certain sections of the country to offer lower wages to untrained laborers. Forced by these conditions, they have no alternative but to take to the road in search of better wages and thus continue the migrant wanderings from State to State, which in Colorado has increased by 57 percent over the last few years.

The whole problem of rural poverty has a tremendous geographical extension and to further complicate it, it has a fluidity that taxes all the Western States that wish to provide education to the migrant young. It also has cultural and linguistic overtones that hinder communication and improvement. It is going to take some very careful planning to ground these migrants and at the same time provide them with a means of livelihood that will result in an improvement of their present economic status. Those responsible for planning an attack on our current rural poverty are going to have to move on many fronts, but there is enough know-how and hopefully enough funds with which to undertake a difficult task for which there isn't too much time. How long will it take? Quien sabe!

I wish to thank you gentlemen for the opportunity of presenting my statement at this hearing.

Mr. HENDERSON: Thank you, Dr. Campa, and I now wonder if the Commission could take just a moment or two and ask one or two questions.

I will recognize Mr. Gallegos.

Mr. GALLEGOS: Dr. Campa, do you feel that the solution of the migrant problem can be improved qualitatively and perhaps be speeded up through legislation which would influence the opportunity for migrant farmers particularly, if they become unionized and have collective bargaining rights and employment insurance; or, do you feel that we need to continue the more specialized programs that will kind of look to the migrant as the whole family and try to continue to develop those programs which will alleviate some of the poverty with them.

Now, where would you place your priorities?

Mr. CAMPA: First of all, we need to study the question: Do we need a migrant population? That would be the first step.

Secondly, is it possible for these migrants to stay at home and earn a living? Under present conditions, obviously not. They do not have the skills.

So the next step would be to prepare those people through Federal legislation, funds and whatnot, for this type of a life of improvement; they are going to have to leave the life they are now leading. As we go along, it will be more and more automated and they will have to have some sort of a specialty. These people cannot afford to go to school and also to make a living.

Therefore, I think it would be an awfully good investment for us to provide the means for these people to go to school, and at the same time be able to live, so that in the next generation they would produce some skilled individuals and there will be no need for this migrant labor.

Mr. HENDERSON: All right, Dr. Gibson.

Mr. GIBSON: From your comments and the question just asked you, I get the impression that there would be a combination between the degree of unionization and the movement of these people from these areas, which would cause a cessation of the migratory patterns.

If, for instance, the price of labor and the conditions of work were brought up to a higher standard by unionization of local labor, the local labor would probably fill that need locally and there would be no need for migration.

Would you say that?

Mr. CAMPA: Yes, that is correct. However, if you will observe the type of farming that goes on in some of these places where they have small land holdings, you will find their methods are very antiquated. They do not produce all that they might, and if they were taught also, this would end in a much better production for them in the areas out in the country.

Then these people could stay home also and produce, and at the same time go into the mechanized agriculture we now have, and these people who stayed could learn that.

Again, it would take some help to do it because they cannot do it on their own; they do not have the necessary know-how.

Mr. HENDERSON: Thank you very much, Dr. Campa. We appreciate very much your coming and sharing your views with us, you may be assured that your prepared statement will be in the record.

Mr. CAMPA: Thank you.

Mr. HENDERSON: We will now recognize Daniel Lund and Mr. J. D. Lorenz.

I might say that following Mr. Lund and Mr. Lorenz, we will hear from Rev. Henry Casso, then Rev. William W. Welsh, and Miss Elizabeth Clark.

I would also like to point out that we will allow you to summarize your presentation in about 10 or 12 minutes and then that will leave us time for a couple of questions.

Mr. LUND: I am Dan Lund, chief, Community Relations, and this is Mr. J. D. Lorenz, the director of California Rural Legal Assistance.

Mr. Lorenz is my boss, and he will make the presentation for us.

STATEMENT OF JAMES D. LORENZ, JR.

Mr. LORENZ: I am James D. Lorenz, Jr., director of the California Rural Legal Assistance, 257 South Spring Street, Los Angeles, Calif. With me is Dan Lund who is chief, Community Relations. And I will speak to legal services for farmworkers and other indigents residing in the rural areas of California.

First, the need.

There are approximately 280,000 farmworkers in California who earn less than $3,000 per year, and an additional 342,000 nonfarmworkers living in the rural areas earning less than $3,000 per year.

These people comprise an ethnic range representing more than a variety of merely national origins; they are descended from the native inhabitants of five different continents and retain, in the color of their skin and physiognomy of their faces, references to at least as many distant civilizations. Anglos who came westward in the 1930's with Steinbeck's Joads; Negroes who left the southern land which their fathers, fresh from Africa, had tilled as slaves; a handful of the Chinese "coolies" who, a century ago, having finished the transcontinental railroad, were released into the California fields; another handful of descendants of the Japanese poor who, after the Chinese Exclusion Act, were imported to replace the Chinese; substantial numbers of the Filipinos who became California agriculture's third source of cheap labor from the Far East, after the Immigration Act of 1924 had barred the Japanese; a sprinkling of Arabs, Armenians, and Hindustani brought over as specialists in the harvesting of certain crops; above all, the tens of thousands of Mexican Americans whose fathers, as liberated peons, fled northward from the chaos of the revolution or who, since that time, have come themselves, as wetbacks or braceros, to be naturalized in the United States; and finally, at the bottom of the health, education, housing, and income ladder, a remnant of what was once the American people—30,000 Indians living on often wretched land, which, after decades of fraud, expropriation, and outright extermination, was finally allotted them—these are the rural poor of "the Golden State," the richest and most populous State in the Union.

Secondly, the neighborhood legal services program.

One of the most important aspects of the War on Poverty by the Office of Economic Opportunity has been the neighborhood legal services program, which attempts to provide legal aid in areas where the poor reside. Neighborhood legal services is somewhat different from traditional legal aid in that it is federally financed and gives the poor comprehensive legal assistance. (There are some areas of the law, such as bankruptcy, which traditional legal aid normally has not handled, although neighborhood legal services will.) CRLA was one of the first such programs to extend services of this type to the rural counties of the State.

Third, the administration of the program.

California Rural Legal Assistance, Inc. (CRLA), is a nonprofit corporation financed by a $1.3-million grant from the Federal Government under the Economic Opportunity Act. The overall policy and direction of the corporation, not related to attorney-client relationships, is determined by a board of 23 directors, to be composed of the rural poor and their representatives, several attorneys who have represented the rural poor, members of rural county bar associations, unofficial representatives of the State bar, and persons who are agriculural producers. Lawyers make up the majority of the board. The legal services of the program are provided by nine regional offices, each of which is staffed by two to three attorneys, two to three nonlawyers trained as investigators, two legal secretaries, and one clerk-typist. These offices are located (from north to south) in Yuba City, Marysville, Santa Rosa, Gilroy, Modesto, Salinas, Madera, Santa Maria, McFarland, and El Centro. In addition, there is a central office, located in Los Angeles, containing the director of the program; the deputy director, who presides over a special research staff engaged in the study of larger legal problems that cannot be adequately handled in the day-to-day practice of the lawyers in the field; the director of community relations (in charge of the training and supervision of the nonlawyers in the program); the administrative chief, and a bookkeeping and secretarial staff.

Fourth, the emphasis on problems of the farmworkers.

In its structure and its planning, CRLA has been particularly interested in providing legal services to the farmworkers of California. They are the largest single poverty group residing in rural areas and, because they often migrate from place to place, are less likely to be served by other legal service programs which are restricted to a single county, where they exist at all. In considering the problems of farmworkers, we thus provide help where it otherwise might not be given. We also thereby reduce the likelihood of duplicating services furnished by other organizations.

But CRLA's services are in no way restricted to farmworkers. The nine regional offices are at the disposal of anyone living in a rural area who can satisfy the eligibility requirements of financial indigency, and who cannot be served by a local neighborhood legal service center, legal aid society, or public defender's office. In many areas, CRLA has worked out cooperative arrangements of mutual referral with these agencies and with the local bar, so as to maximize the local resources for coping with what always remains an overwhelming need.

Fifth, the statewide structure.

The maintenance of a legal service program covering more than one rural county is indispensable if legal aid of any sort is to be available in the sparsely populated regions of the State where no single county has a population large enough to support a legal services program of its own. But there are advantages to a statewide program in the more populous rural counties as well. Only a statewide program can continually serve clients who are compelled by their work to migrate from one area of the State to another, repeatedly crossing county lines and so almost certainly losing touch with attorneys whose operations are restricted by these jurisdictional boundaries.

The Office of Economic Opportunity has explicitly recognized the necessity of breaking through such barriers if certain groups of the poor are to be offered any substantial relief. The Community Action Program Guide provides:

> ". . . an entire State or even a number of States may constitute a community as a basis for action with respect to the problems of the poor such as migratory workers and seasonal agricultural laborers, whose needs cannot be adequately met on a more restricted geographical basis."

Economy of scale is also possible with a statewide organization. Moreover, the employment of a sizable staff by a large project permits an increased division of labor, and genuinely efficient specialization. Recruiting and retaining highly capable lawyers to serve the poor has proved much easier for a program of this magnitude.

But the major reason for establishing a statewide program, first and last, is that the rural poor need all the help they can get. Sad experience is already teaching us that neither CRLA alone, nor county programs, nor the most hard-working and effective combinations of the two, can begin to furnish the legal assistance which the poor so desperately continue to need.

We would like to submit a proposal to capitalize a rural development corporation for the creation of new communities for low income people in rural California. This proposal was prepared by the Rural Development Corporation of Los Angeles, Calif., on January 24, 1967. It was written by Gary Bellow, James Lorenz, and Dennis Powell.

I. THE PROBLEM: AN OVERVIEW

Much of the housing in rural California in which low income people live is in deplorable condition; about this there can be no argument. According to the "Report on Housing in California" released in 1963 by the Governor's Advisory Commission on Housing Problems, 63 percent of the dwelling units occupied by general fieldworkers were found to be dilapidated or deteriorated; in 33 percent of the houses surveyed, the only toilet facilities were pit privies; 30 percent of the dwellings had no bathing facilities; and 25 percent lacked even so basic a necessity as a kitchen sink with running water.

What is surprising about the commission's report are some of the subsidiary facts which they uncovered about low income rural housing. A full 40 percent of the 1,060 farmworker families surveyed reported that they owned or were purchasing their own housing. Fifty-six percent of these persons lived in houses which complied with local housing codes. These figures indicate that acceptable housing is not now entirely beyond the buying power of many farmworkers.

These figures do not, of course, suggest that all farmworker families, or even a majority of them, are presently capable of purchasing or renting standard housing. Nor do the figures provide assurance that acceptable housing is in fact available for those capable of purchasing it. What becomes apparent is that there is a discrepancy between the number of people who can pay for standard housing and the amount of such housing presently available, as well as a gap between those who need good housing and those who are able to pay for it.

The number of farmworkers and other persons falling into this former category, and the level of income which they have attained can be estimated to some degree. There are some 300,000 persons in California who earn their principal income from agricultural employment on land which they themselves do not own, or who are members of families engaged in such employment. Virtually all these people reside in the agricultural valleys of the State, where farmwork is to be found. More than 94 percent of them, or approximately 282,000 persons, earn less than $4,000 per annum. By rough estimates, there may be as many as 590,000 other poor people, not engaged in farmwork, who live in rural areas of the State. Though these statewide census figures do not indicate how many of these other people reside in the State's agricultural valleys, it seems safe to assume that at least one-half of them—or 295,000—do, since the agricultural valleys are by far the most populated rural areas of the State. Thus, a total of approximately 577,000 (282,000 farmworkers and 295,000 nonfarmworkers) reside in the agricultural valleys of the State and earn less than $4,000 per year.

According to the State Report on Housing, the median annual income of all farmworker families surveyed was $2,668. Fewer than 20 percent of the families covered in the study lived in dwellings considered adequate. Assuming that all of the families below the median income level (50 percent of all the families surveyed) lived in substandard housing, three-fifths of the remaining families (or 84,600 people), must have also resided in substandard dwellings. The families in this latter group had incomes over the median annual income level. Assuming that approximately the same percentages apply to the nonfarmworker families, an additional 87,600 people with median incomes over $2,700 per year also lived in substandard dwellings. If a family is capable of spending up to one-fourth of its income for housing, as it is commonly supposed, each family earning more than the median could spend a minimum of $675 per year for housing. Standard housing, it has been demonstrated, can be built cheaply enough to be purchased for as little as $675 per year. Therefore, it may be concluded, some 172,200 persons (84,600 farmworkers and 87,600 nonfarmworkers) who now reside in substandard housing could afford to purchase acceptable housing, if such housing were built.

However, new low cost housing is not being constructed, apparently because it does not return a profit large enough to attract private developers. Supposedly, the Federal Government is encouraging construction of low cost housing through a series of subsidized grant-in-aid, direct loan, and mortgage guarantee programs. Farmers Home Administration loans are periodically made to county housing authorities, but no mechanisms have been established by which the residents of the housing camps can purchase the houses that are built, nor even control the communities in which they live. Because many of the farmworkers residing in labor camps remain there only at the pleasure of the housing authorities, the camps are notorious vehicles for discouraging the pride of ownership and community organization which are essential if the poor are to be able to help themselves. Self-help housing projects, financed by Farmers Home Administration loans, have been undertaken in the San Joaquin Valley, and by the end of 1967, more than 40 low income families will have helped to build their own houses. Self-help housing also has severe limitations, however. Hirshen and Van der Ryn, two long-time proponents of self-help housing, have noted that about 1,000 hours of self-help labor are required to complete a house. Given the substantial amount of time which a family must invest to build its own house, the number of houses which can be built is severely limited. This labor is relatively uneconomical, and, along with the administrative and technical assistance costs of $2,200 per house, raises the total cost of the house to about equal the cost of comparable housing for sale on the private market.

Nowhere in rural California is the Federal Government assisting in the financing of large-scale, low cost housing projects, which would be owned or controlled by low income residents, despite the large number of Federal programs designed to aid the poor. The Federal Government's reticence seems to be the result of a number of anomolies.

Although several programs are designed to assist the poor and the uneducated, the applications which must be filled out require an expertise and sophistication about credit and economics which poor people do not normally possess. Although housing experts equipped to negotiate loans, solicit buyers, and explore potential investments are employed by private developers, they have not been present to any large extent in the public sector, where they are needed the most. Although new construction techniques have been developed which can substantially reduce the cost of home construction, these methods have often not been used to generate low cost housing. Although one of the purposes of housing codes is to improve the condition of housing of low income people, these codes, when not revamped to take account of technological change, can become outmoded and actually impede the development of innovative, low cost housing.

For these conundrums, we can supply no single panacea. We do suggest that low cost housing is purchasable by many so-called poor people; that is, the expertise gap between the "private" and "public" sectors is narrowed, so that capable developers were working in low income housing projects, financable housing packages could be presented to funding sources.

The following is planned: A California charitable corporation, Rural Development Corporation, has been incorporated. The corporation, which would be initially concerned with the financing and construction of low income housing projects, would be run on a nonprofit basis, thereby eliminating the developer's usual need to earn a profit commensurate with that realizable in the development of middle income housing. Housing specialists as capable as those found in "private" development organization would be hired. The specialists would design housing units which, in fact, would be of low cost, would locate possible sources of financing, would negotiate loans, would prepare the complicated applications required by Federal funding agencies, and would operate on a scale large enough to realize substantial economies.

II. THE TREND TOWARD DEVELOPMENT CORPORATIONS: A PROPOSED EXTENSION IN RURAL CALIFORNIA

In the January 7, 1967, issue of the New Republic, James Ridgeway wrote:

> While faith in the miracle-working power of the Office of Economic Opportunity has faded, there is some hope within Congress and the Administration that private industry can be recruited to carry out the war on poverty. . . . The creation and manipulation of markets is much in vogue in Washington and is part of what the Administration calls 'creative federalism.' Just as the Government gets industry to build spaceships to go to the moon, now it wants business to turn technology to putting across the programs of the Great Society.

In one sense at least, the above quote is misleading; Federal programs concerned with poverty have always viewed private organizations as working partners and, in fact, the Economic Opportunity Act provides that OEO grants may be made directly to private nonprofit corporations. No one would contend, moreover, that future changes will eliminate Government from that partnership: grants-in-aid and direct loans from Federal agencies will still be necessary if the private sector is to be encouraged to enter low income markets.

What is becoming clear, however, and what the above quotation indicates, is that the approach to reform is changing. Multiple services—health, education, counseling, training—even on a decentralized basis, are not sufficient to deal with the basic economics of poverty. Community organization with all its potential for achieving a sense of participation and purpose will inevitably flounder if its concern for confrontation and protest does not lead to institutional and functional relationships.

The environment itself, the slum as well as the slum dweller, is becoming the focal point of rehabilitation. Economic institutions are being formed, in which the poor can participate as employees, tenants, shareholders, and managers. New jobs are being created for participants in job training programs. And throughout these projects, an increasing amount of training, management, technical assistance, and fundraising is being undertaken by private corporations which have entered into contractual relations with the Federal Government.

U.S. Gypsum, for example, is spending $1,250,000 to rebuild a square block in Harlem, and intends to start similar projects in other cities. Senator Robert Kennedy has announced the establishment of the Bedford-Stuyvesant Renewal and Rehabilitation Corporation, a nonprofit organization which will draft plans for housing, health clinics, recreational facilities, and commercial and industrial development in Harlem. In North Philadelphia, Armstrong Cork Company is now rehabilitating a tenement, on an experimental basis, and the American Plywood Association, a manufacturers trade group, is investing $150,000 to renovate buildings in the Hough area of Cleveland. The city of Philadelphia has invested $2 million in capital in the Philadelphia Housing Development Corp., a nonprofit body governed by a board of directors appointed by the mayor. In Washington, D.C., the Washington Housing Development Corporation has been formed, and is seeking OEO funds. The Local Development Services division of Urban American, Inc., another nonprofit corporation, is providing technical assistance to more than 15 groups wishing to construct or rehabilitate low cost housing.

Despite the growth of such organizations, the need continues for additional assistance. Urban American, Inc., reported in 1966 that it received more than 300 requests for technical aid which it was unable to handle. Some of this need might be filled by the Rural Development Corporation, and by other organizations, yet unformed. More important, other problems not encountered by these other corporations might be considered by RDC. RDC would be the only development corporation discussed here which would be based west of the Mississippi. RDC would be the only development corporation addressing itself to a population which is largely Mexican American. RDC would be the only organization with a statewide orientation and a connection with a statewide legal service program (California Rural Legal Assistance). RDC would be the only organization which would concentrate on rural areas.

The different constituency aided by RDC, and the unique geographical area which it would serve, will necessarily mean that its mode of operation will vary substantially from that of other development corporations—and herein, perhaps, lies RDC's major significance. Because RDC would concentrate on areas which have little community organization and virtually no existing and low cost housing projects, RDC would undertake the complete development of housing projects, from start to finish, rather than providing interstitial technical assistance, at only one or two stages of the project, as is commonly done by development corporations in urban areas. By functioning on a statewide basis RDC would experiment with different modes of construction, and would provide evaluation and an overview on economic expansion throughout rural California. (RDC's involvement from the beginning also means that the project will be better designed and more easily financable.) By working in outlying areas with large amounts of open land, RDC will be able to undertake much larger, more comprehensively planned projects than is possible in urban areas, where most of the land is already built upon.

A more detailed description of RDC's various prospective functions is contained in the following sections of this proposal, which discuss what must be done to enhance the feasibility of low cost housing construction in rural California. In considering the complexity of this problem, the following sections serve to further define the peculiar nature of RDC, and to emphasize the need for expertise in the rural low cost housing field.

III. THE VARIOUS FUNCTIONS OF THE RURAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

A. *Housing Development*

More than 20 California bankers, private developers, real estate buyers, municipal government experts, governmental officials, and building trade union officers, have been asked how they would go about developing low cost housing for California's rural poor. The various considerations which they cited are listed here as a simplified example of the type of investigation which the Rural Development Corporation could undertake.

1. *Identification of possible sources of financing for low income housing projects*

Since money is the essential ingredient, the development corporation should begin its work by canvassing potential sources of funds. No lender-guarantor would appear to be more promising than the Federal Government.

a. Federal subsidized programs involving private recipients.

Pursuant to Section 515 of the Housing Act of 1949, the Farmers Home Administration can make direct, 3-percent, 50-year loans to nonprofit corporations to construct low cost rental housing for elderly persons living in rural areas. The Department of Housing and Urban Development can make substantially the same kinds of loans to elderly people in urban areas (each having more than 5,500 residents), who are not able to qualify for Farmers Home Administration financing.

The Farmers Home Administration can also make direct, 5-percent, 33-year loans to nonprofit corporations formed to benefit farmworkers, under Section 514 of the Housing Act of 1949. Under Section 516, the Farmers Home Administration can make grants up to one-half of the total development costs for farm labor housing.

Title V of the Housing Act of 1949 allows the Farmers Home Administration to make direct and insured loans to rural residents who wish to construct housing themselves on land which they already own. Normally, these loans are part of a self-help housing project, where the loan recipients aid in the construction of their own homes.

Title III-B of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 brings the Office of Economic Opportunity into the low cost housing field. OEO is allowed to make loans, loan guarantees, and grants up to $1,500 per family, for farmworker housing.

The Housing and Urban Redevelopment Act of 1965 provides for grants by the Department of Housing and Urban Development to nonprofit corporations to construct experimental housing, which, conceivably, could be developed for a low income market.

Section 221 (d) (3) of the National Housing Act allows a nonprofit corporation to receive Federal insurance on loans for new construction or rehabilitation of substandard housing. Under Section 221 (d) (3), the private lender would advance money at the market rate of interest, the loan would then be purchased by the Federal National Mortgage Association, and the nonprofit sponsor would pay the Government a below-market interest rate of 3 percent over a 40-year period. The difference in cost between the market and below-market interest payments is absorbed by the Government. Where the corporate sponsor of the Section 221 (d) (3) project is created as a real estate cooperative, those tenants who are members of the cooperative acquire an immediate sharehold interest in the housing which is constructed. For those tenants who cannot afford the rents which would be charged after the property is rehabilitated, Section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 allows rent to be paid by the

Federal Housing Administration to mortgagors of FHA Section 221 (d) (3) projects, such supplements representing the difference between 25 percent of the tenants' income and the fair market rent for the project, as approved by FHA. Thus, the program involves two elements: the construction or rehabilitation of a project under FHA Section 221 (d) (3) market interest rates, and the FHA-housing owner contract for the payment of rent supplements.

Under Section 221 (h) of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, nonprofit corporations could acquire and rehabilitate a significant volume of housing with FHA mortgage insurance, and resell them to low income families financed by below-market, 3 percent loans.

b. Federal subsidized programs involving public recipients.

If low cost housing developers were able to persuade a public body to be the recipient of Federal funds, then several more exciting opportunities could open up. Under the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act, a community could become a demonstration city, and receive grants-in-aid as a means of financing housing projects for poor people. While it is doubtful whether a number of rural communities of the 15,000 to 40,000 range could be quickly persuaded to take such a novel step, and utilize legislation which is still untried, other communities made up almost entirely of poor people (such as Wasco, in Kern County; Pixley, in Tulare County; and South Dos Pallos, in Merced County) might very well seize upon the demonstration city concept as an expeditious means of replacing their old, substandard shacks with new housing.

Urban renewal, pursuant to the Housing Act of 1954, is another possible means of financing. While many rural communities have resisted urban renewal; small localities, which are made up largely of poor people, might be willing to approve urban renewal, as long as it meant development of new housing for the residents, not the elimination of their existing homes. The Urban Renewal Administration is authorized to make 3 percent, 20-year loans (usually identified as Section 312 loans) to owners or tenants of housing in urban renewal areas, or in areas not so designated but in which there is an officially recognized program consisting of intensive code enforcement. The funds are disbursed through local public agencies.

Public housing, under the Housing Act of 1937, poses another possibility, which could be acceptable to low income people if the housing authority were formed so that it was controlled by the prospective residents of the housing. Even where public housing structures do not now exist (and this is so in many rural communities), a Public Housing Administration might be created, to lease privately owned dwellings which meet local housing standards, for the use of low income families. Thus, public housing need not be constructed in order to be available.

c. Federal nonsubsidized programs.

Although the conventional wisdom indicates that programs which offer nonsubsidized housing are out of the range of most low income families, because of the stringent standards which the applicants must satisfy if not also because of the higher market interest rates they must pay, these programs should nonetheless be mentioned briefly, on the chance that any planned development which is put together might include houses for families in the $4,500 to $7,000 income range, as well as families in the $2,000 to $4,500 range, and also because the capital fund (discussed in Part III-B of this proposal) may be able to generate private funds.

Federal multifamily programs include: The Federal Housing Administration (FHA) Section 207 Rental Mortgage Insurance, which insures loans made to various forms of private entities and individuals; the FHA Section 213 cooperative program providing for loans to profit or nonprofit corporations; FHA Section 220 Mortgage Insurance for Multifamily Housing in Urban Renewal Areas; FHA Section 221 (d) (4) Mortgage Insurance which, in emphasizing assistance to moderate income, displaced, and handicapped applicants, allows FHA approval of applications which would be unacceptable for 207 financing; FHA Section 231 Mortgage Insurance for Housing for the Elderly; FHA Section 234 Mortgage Insurance for Condominium Housing; and Experimental Housing Insurance.

Federal single-family programs include: the FHA Section 203 (b) Basic Home Ownership Mortgage Insurance; FHA Section 203 (i) Mortgage Insurance for Moderately Priced Housing in Outlying Areas; FHA Mortgage Insurance for Home Improvement; Section 220 Home Mortgage Insurance Program for Urban Renewal Areas; FHA Section 220 (h) Mortgage Insurance for Home Improvement in Urban Renewal Areas; the Farmers Home Administration Insured and Direct Home Loan Programs; and the Veterans' Administration Home Loan Guaranty and Direct Home Loan Programs.

d. State programs.

The State of California also has undertaken several housing programs. The "Cal-Vet," California Farm and Home Loan Program, which is the largest State-financed home loan program in the nation, provides low interest home and farm loans to veterans, the loan fund being financed in part by general obligation bonds issued by the State.

Under Title III-B of the Economic Opportunity Act, substantial Federal funds have been granted to the State of California, which, in turn allocates them to various temporary projects to house farmworkers 6 months of every year.

The wide range of Federal and State housing programs, each with their own regulations and applications, suggests that locating of financing is a complicated question with which few people are now prepared to deal. For which programs has Congress appropriated funds sufficient to make widespread loans? Which of these programs still have unexpended funds? (1966 monies for self-help projects were reportedly used up by October 1966.) Special State quotas may have been established, and particular regulations may have been promulgated which could substantially affect a group's chances of securing Federal loans. (Regulations governing the operation of the Farmers Home Administration have recently been published, but are not readily available to the public.) Since the type of housing project which is developed may depend upon the type of financing which it secures, the developers must know what financing they are most likely to receive in order to design the project accordingly. For example, if the developer were aware of the availability of Section 221 (d) (3) money, he might undertake a rehabilitation rather than a self-help construction project.

Some housing projects, planned to achieve a number of purposes at the same time, might have to be pieced together out of several Federal programs, further requiring that *all* programs be analyzed before the package is assembled. Moreover, careful scrutiny of alternative methods of financing is required by the terms of some enabling legislation, which—as in the case of VA direct loans—require that other methods of financing be shown to be unavailable before a loan can be approved pursuant to the legislation in question. Finally, it might be argued, approval of part of a program by one agency might be prima facie evidence to other agencies that the project is a feasible one which is worthy of their participation. Again, this requires the would-be low cost housing developer to make a canvass of all possible financing sources.

The main reason for making an intensive survey of various financing sources is the need to determine which kinds of financing can be afforded by which kinds of low income people. Assume, for example, that house and land with improvements could be purchased for $7,500. If purchased with a Section 221 (d) (3) loan, the housing unit would require yearly payments of approximately $413 ($225 for interest, $188 for principal), plus payments of approximately $75 for insurance and taxes, or a total of some $488.00. This amount would appear to be well within the range of farmworkers earning more than $2,300 per year. If Farmers Home Administration 5-percent, 33-year loans were utilized, the total yearly purchase cost would rise to approximately $677, an amount which could still be paid by persons earning more than $2,700. If, on the other hand, private loans were secured at the prevailing 7-percent interest rate, for the prevailing period of 8 years, home purchase would only be possible for a family earning more than $5,800 a year, whether or not the loan was guaranteed by FHA. Thus, even a cursory survey of financing rates indicates that the financing of low cost housing must depend upon programs which are subsidized by Federal agencies, or by a loan fund which is part of the development corporation's initial capitalization. (The latter possibility is discussed in Part III-B of this proposal.) More investigation of this kind needs to be done by the development corporation.

2. *Characterization of potential recipient groups*

The statute establishing the Farmers Home Administration specifically provides that farmworkers who are veterans will be given precedence over those who are not. Under the California Farm and Home Loan Program, farmworkers are not eligible at all for loans unless they are veterans. Yet a brief survey of recent rural California housing proposals indicates that the proposed recipients have been automatically characterized as farmworkers, and that no inquiries have been made as to how many of them are veterans.

A poor person's eligibility to receive funds may thus depend upon his membership in a particular group—the veterans, the elderly, the farmworkers. If he is a member of more than one group—and is, let us say, both a farmworker and a veteran—he could, conceivably, have his choice, and submit his application to that program with the most money and/or with the most liberal loan policies. In order to do so, he must be characterized as a farmworker or as a veteran, as well as know what the loan policies are. If he is to be part of a large, low cost housing development which is sponsored by a single nonprofit corporation, he must be joined by others like himself who would participate in the project. The task of characterization might well be one of the initial responsibilities of the Rural Development Corporation.

3. *Determination of who is able to lease or purchase low cost housing: an analysis of risks*

The pamphlets describing various Federal housing programs are filled with language indicating that housing, like food, clothing, and other basic necessities of life, shall be made available according to need. Yet in fact, most of these programs provide aid only to those who are able to pay monthly rents of $40 or more and who, as "good risks," are likely to repay the few low interest loans which are meted out. Low cost housing is not now a reality for everyone. It does appear to be a possibility for some people earning less than $4,000 per year, as we have already seen. Exactly how much less than this a family can earn and still aspire to acceptable low cost housing remains to be seen.

To our knowledge, no exhaustive study has recently been made as to which families are likely to be the best risks. From the informal surveys of the families participating in the self-help housing project, it would appear that a family's present income level need not be the sole—nor necessarily the most important—indication of the family's ability to repay a housing loan. The size of the family, the age of the parents, their job experience during the past 5 years, the likelihood that their present jobs will be automated out of existence, their proximity to alternative forms of work—are all aspects of their familial solvency which should be considered. A family's indebtedness, both as to the size and number of debts which it has incurred, is perhaps the single best indication of its financial health and determination to meet its obligations.

Usually, Government agencies like the Farmers Home Administration do not appear to make this kind of a comprehensive financial analysis. (The 4 to 8 months which the Farmers Home Administration takes to process an application is, alas, no assurance that the application has received discerning scrutiny.) Apparently, unless an application has been safe on all counts (yearly income over $3,500, low level of indebtedness, etc.) he does not receive a loan. A careful study of his situation *might* reveal that he is strong enough in certain key categories (yearly income level which is steadily increasing) to merit a loan.

Because Government agencies must be persuaded that they do not take increased risks simply because they consider an increasing number of risk factors, it is essential that a thorough risk analysis of each prospective applicant be undertaken *before* the expensive and time-consuming task of preparing a loan application is undertaken. Some poor persons will be incapable of receiving housing loans; they should be identified immediately so that they are not included in a paper proposal in which they can never afford to participate. Other poor persons may be able to meet housing payments, despite their low incomes: They should be certified as such, and a case should be presented on their behalf when loan applications are finally submitted to Government agencies and private lenders.

After the risks are tabulated, it may be determined that Federal or foundation loan guarantees will be necessary, in order to pry loose direct loans for low cost housing; and furthermore, that rent supplements and other grants-in-aid might also be included in the package, if certain low income people are to be included in the housing project. Risk calculation is thus a condition precedent not only to an economic selection of prospective application, but also to a determination of what kind of loan package should be sought.

4. *Design of low cost housing units: the search for an acceptable environment at the lowest cost per square foot*

In a recent experiment in rehabilitating a tenement on the lower east side of Manhattan, a crane picked prefabricated kitchen and bathroom units off a truck, and dropped them down through a hole cut in the building's roof. It took an hour to bolt them into place. New kinds of wallboards and vinyl flooring have been found practicable, as well as windows that can be expanded to fit the odd shape openings in old buildings. Garbage can be dropped down a chute into a machine that first compresses it, then disinfects and perfumes it. These developments in rehabilitation, while not applicable to rural areas which, by and large, require new construction, are indicative of the extent through which modern research manufacturing techniques can be used to substantially lower the cost of housing.

Similar work has already been undertaken for rural housing in California. Sanford Hirshen and Sim Van der Ryn, Berkeley architects and planners, have designed a low cost housing prototype of 900 square feet and three bedrooms (which can accommodate six to seven people) consisting of a steel frame shell, internal space-defining elements, and a plumbing and mechanical systems core that can be prefabricated and adapted to a wide range of options. The prototype is set on a concrete slab, is demountable, and can be moved to different locations, giving the residents a degree of mobility and economic freedom not common among California's farmworkers.

Each prototype house, including lighting and air conditioning, will cost $5,400, it is estimated by Hirshen and Van der Ryn, who have already constructed one unit, at a price somewhat below that figure. If the houses were mass produced, the unit cost would be somewhat lower, probably about 10 percent, or $540. Land for the house is likely to cost $200 to $500, computed by dividing the average cost of an acre of land in rural areas ($2,000 to $3,000) by the number of houses which can be built on each acre (10 to 20). Improvements, including grading, construction of roads, erection of street lights, and laying of sewers, will run no more than an additional $1,500 per lot—making a maximum total house cost of $7,400. With Section 221 (d) (3) financing, the house could be purchased with yearly payments of approximately $480, or monthly payments of $40, not including payment for insurance, taxes, and utilities. This amount appears to be within the purchasing power of rural residents earning more than $2,700 per year.

Hirshen and Van der Ryn have designed another house, with a concrete frame, which would cost $3,500 or, with land improvements added, a total of $5,500. This would appear to be within the purchasing range of some people earning less than $2,700 per year.

Use of mobile trailer homes may be another means of acquiring houses at low cost. Although normally somewhat smaller than conventional houses, mobile homes enjoy a number of advantages not found in conventional housing. While a house is subject to real property taxes because it is affixed to the land, mobile trailer homes are considered personal property of the owner and are not taxable as real property. Conventional homes must be constructed or assembled on the site by contractors who subcontract with high-priced building tradesmen—thereby increasing costs. Mobile homes, on the other hand, can be built like cars in a factory, on an assembly line. While conventional low cost houses are bound by complicated housing and building codes and subdivision ordinances, mobile homes often are not. On-site housing, furthermore, may involve novel design techniques (to make it low cost), which will, by its very looks, identify it as low cost housing and make it harder to sell to people who do not like to be identified as low cost people. Trailers, on the other hand, are purchased every day by middle income people, and can be readily marketed. Finally, whereas conventional housing cannot be moved around easily, mobile housing can be. This is important to a developer who may wish to keep his development plan flexible. It is crucial for owners who, being mobile, may wish to move their homes with them.

This discussion alone is not a conclusive argument for mobile homes, as opposed to more conventional housing. Reportedly, for example, the Farmers Home Administration will not loan money for mobile homes; and an initial cost analysis on mobile homes indicates that a unit may cost more than is expected—about $5,500—and involve as much as a $1,200 downpayment. What is clear is that, in creating a development, there are a number of design alternatives which should be considered. Increased investigation must be made as to how housing costs can be lowered.

5. *A market analysis: who is willing to buy what*

The house versus trailer debate points out the obvious necessity of developing a product which can sell. Poor people, like anyone else, must be persuaded to make a purchase, especially of an item which may cost them as much as 20 percent of their yearly income, encumber them with a long-term debt, and which might tie them to a particular locality (and therefore to particular kinds of jobs). What do people want, and what are they willing to pay for? Cursory surveys indicate that the Mexican-American low income consumer wants a single-family, single-story house which, despite its independence, is also part of a residential community, composed of a common meeting area, community hall, church, and shopping areas. Despite these generalities, however, we know precious little about what is wanted by people of limited means who live in rural areas. Before substantial time and money is invested in a housing project, a market analysis needs to be made.

6. *Preparation of a development timetable*

Time is of the essence in the construction industry. One phase must be planned, financed, and in some cases completed before another phase can begin. What is done when must be worked out ahead of time. Furthermore, sophisticated contingency planning must be provided so that, if one course of action proves unsuccessful, another can be tried and dove tailed with other phases of the project, thereby maintaining the rhythm of the overall development. Such planning requires expertise; and also necessitates financial resources sufficient to wait out rejected loan applications, bad weather, labor difficulties, and other unlucky eventualities. Because of their lack of funds and immediate needs, poor people, by themselves, do not have the needed staying power. The proposed development corporation would.

7. *Location of possible development sites*

The proverbial needle in the haystack may be no harder to find than the proper site for a low cost rural housing development. The land must be cheap (which is more likely in rural areas, where land is plentiful, than it is in urban areas); it should be surrounded with pleasant scenery; it should be located as close as possible to good schools, churches, and municipal services which will be needed by the development's residents; it should be large enough in size to allow for future expansion; it should be located close to jobs; it should be zoned to permit planned residential development and, perhaps, the inclusion of commercial and industrial facilities which would not only service residents but also employ them; it should tap an adequate water supply; its topography should be flat, to allow for the cheapest possible development; it should be removed from adverse land uses, such as heavy industry, garbage dumps, and airport holding pattern or takeoff zones; it should be capable of inexpensive storm water disposals; and it should be near a large number of poor people who need housing and who would be willing to live in a new development.

Other factors governing site selection of middle income housing projects may not be necessary for a low income project. Highway access, though desirable, may unnecessarily inflate the cost of the land. Location of the development in a "good neighborhood" may be politically or economically impossible; more feasible might be situation of the development on open farmland.

Negotiations might be undertaken with municipal and county government officials to assure ahead of time that local regulations can be complied with and that public services will be provided to the development. Since construction of the development will inject money into the economy of one or more rural communities, the development, if presented properly, could be something to be sought after and competed for by a number of communities. Just as private industry canvasses localities for the most attractive deal, so, too, could the Rural Development Corporation. This would mean that prospective residents of the housing project would be solicited and organized only after a preliminary canvass had been made.

Because many Federal programs require description of the proposed development property, and because the cost of the property will undoubtedly rise if it is purchased after the Federal loan is approved, the development corporation might pick up options on particularly attractive pieces of property before a loan application is submitted. Again, this requires financial resources which poor people do not have; but in the end, purchase of options should lower the cost of development.

8. *Planning the community*

Consider the plans, surveys, tests, and reports which are required for a large-scale development project: a preliminary title report; soil bearing tests; surface water and flood control surveys; analyses of local housing and building codes, zoning ordinances, and regional and master plans; boundary surveys; topographic maps; area maps; aerial maps; plans for landscaping, including suppression of noise and screening of objectionable surroundings; a public area plan showing local schools, parks, and public buildings; a long-range land utilization plan by years; tentative and final subdivision maps; a final title report; and detailed architectural and engineering plans and specifications. The need here for expertise and coordination is obvious.

9. *Locating and organizing prospective residents*

Now that the developer has defined the nature of a feasible project and determined what kind of low income persons are capable of participating in it, he can talk about the project with prospective beneficiaries. Undoubtedly, there are a number of features about the housing package which need not be initially determined by the developer, but which can be left to the determination of the target populations. In order to avoid creating unreasonable expectations, the developer must know exactly what are the variables over which the participants can have control, and what are the constants as dictated by Federal policy, construction conditions, and market realities. The conversation with the "client community" is thus a give and take within carefully defined limits. Part of the dialog will involve prescriptions by the clients, who will describe the kinds of houses and community which they desire; and part of the conversation will involve selling by the developer, who will try to persuade prospective clients as to the feasibility and the benefits of low cost housing.

Perhaps the major consideration raised at this stage is organizational; how the people are to be assisted in organizing themselves so that they will have a maximum of control over the project which develops and, ideally, have an opportunity to acquire ownership of the project. It is commonly assumed that a resident's participation can be achieved through the legal device of a condominium, an individually owned unit in a project which also has certain common areas owned by the unit owner as tenant in common with other condominium owners; or by the cooperative, in which the resident is a stockholder in a corporation which owns the project and facilities, or in which each resident has a tenancy in common in the entire project with an exclusive right to occupy his particular section.

To cite these legal devices is not to provide an easy solution to the problem of organization. The developer and the participants must decide which kind of common ownership, if any, they wish to have; they must determine when common ownership will be undertaken; they must provide how the property will be managed and the common areas maintained, and how the appearance of the property will be regulated and what, if any, covenants will run with the land; they must be advised of their potential liability for taxes and for lien payments, particularly on common areas; and they must decide how subsequent sales of individual units and/or part or all the common areas are to be accomplished. Until now in California, the condominium and, to a lesser extent, the cooperative have been devices restricted to developments for the upper-middle class. There is some question as to whether poor people, organized into a condominium for the first time, would be willing to vote for the assessments necessary to provide management and maintenance for common areas. Some kind of an interim arrangement may be preferable, such as ownership and operation by the development corporation, or by a subsidiary management corporation for a preliminary, predetermined period of time.

10. *Making preliminary application*

Some Federal agencies, such as the Federal Housing Administration, require submission of preliminary applications. With other agencies, this procedure may be advisable, even though it is not required, since preparation of a final application may be highly time consuming and costly—and cannot be justified—if the agency was, from the beginning, unwilling to make a grant for the proposed project.

The preliminary application enables the applicant to take a sounding of the financing sources; to meet the agency's or bank's key personnel; to learn about their procedures firsthand; and to determine the circumstances, if any, under which they would be willing to commit funds. For the plans which do not materialize in projects, the preliminary application allows the developer to minimize his losses and to move on to other projects which may be more successful. For the projects which do result, the preliminary application provides an opportunity to cut redtape and to expedite processing of the final application.

11. *Financing collateral projects: the search for the comprehensive development*

A housing project involves more than houses: streets and lighting and sewerlines and water mains must also be provided, for example. The Farmers Home Administration makes loans and grants to public bodies and nonprofit groups to develop, for rural residents, domestic water supply and waste disposal systems. Title I of the Public Works and Economic Development Act provides for grants to public works development programs for the improvement of public facilities such as water and sewage systems and access roads, in order to encourage industrial development. The Department of Housing and Urban Development will make public facility loans to public instrumentalities for health stations, neighborhood centers, and other facilities serving low income groups. Priority, the statute expressly provides, shall be given to the applications of smaller municipalities.

It is conceivable that the General Services Administration, the Defense Department, or other Federal agencies might make Government surplus property available to poor people. While this was attempted unsuccessfully by the NAACP in Mississippi, Henry Aronson, the former director of the program there, still believes that such a program is feasible and could be undertaken, much as the surplus food program has been handled by the Agriculture Department.

12. *Preparation of the full loan application*

The application forms which Federal agencies require to be filled out can be complicated and confusing, involving not only a full description of the project, but also proof of satisfaction of numerous Federal regulations. Under Section 202 of the Housing Act of 1949, for example, the Farmers Home Administration requires each prospective mortgagor to demonstrate that it is unable to construct the proposed project with its own funds; that it is unable to obtain the necessary credit from private or cooperative sources upon reasonable terms and conditions; that it has initial operating capital and that sufficient income will be obtained to cover operating expenses, make necessary capital purchases or replacements, pay all debts, and repay the loan as required under the terms of the mortgage; that it has the ability to purchase any necessary maintenance equipment and furnishings; that it possesses the legal capacity, character, ability, and experience to incur and carry out all obligations pertaining to the loan transaction, and so forth. Loan applications which take 4 to 8 months for skilled administrators to process are not matters which can be put together easily.

13. *Later stages of development*

It is doubtful whether, within a year, the developer can do more than prepare plans for low cost housing, organize the potential recipients, and procure the financing. Actual construction of the projects would most likely take place in the second year, as would negotiations with building trade unions working on the project, training of management and maintenance staffs, instruction of residents in home management and maintenance, and establishment of subsidiary projects and businesses. Because a housing development does not make a community, a large amount of work will remain after the bricks and mortar phase of development.

14. *Technical assistance to other projects*

It is anticipated that the technical expertise of a housing development corporation could be drawn upon by other low income projects; in this regard, the corporation might provide technical assistance on a piecemeal basis. But the advantages of technical assistance should not be overestimated: Development, it is believed, is not likely to be successful if it is expert only in one phase. The development corporation's program, while ambitious, cannot be spread too thin. Focus appears to be too often lacking from low income projects which, in their proposals at least, suggest that a multitude of "interrelated" and "coordinated" programs are possible.

15. *Assessment of government programs and procedures: an opportunity for reform*

It is entirely possible that one or more of the projects prepared by the development corporation will not be funded by Federal agencies. While such a refusal may be the result of faults in the proposed project, it might just as well be due to Government expectations and procedures which are unrealistic and unworkable. A bad application is the test of nothing; an application which is competently prepared—and which is turned down—may, on the other hand, highlight an agency's limitations, and may provide impetus for reform. The interests of poor people may be tried and adjudicated in an administrative agency, as well as in a court of law. Thus, applications for Federal funds may be considered as significant "test cases" for the poor.

Conversely, in those instances when a project application is approved, precedent is established which may argue for approval of similar applications which are subsequently prepared. Experience tends to define and, ultimately, to minimize risk.

B. *Capital Formation*

Thus far in this analysis, it has been assumed that other people's money will be used to finance low cost housing development, and that the money available to the development corporation would be used for the payment of salaries of full-time staff members and the remuneration of consultants, all of whom will work to procure capital from other sources. If development is to have a reasonable chance of success, however, money should be available for purposes other than the hiring of personnel. It is axiomatic that it is money that "makes money," as well as expertise and negotiation. A capital fund is an essential part of the real estate program's first year of operation.

The fund would be used for the following purposes:

1. *Payment of nonpersonnel, development expenses*

Insurance, taxes, surety bonds, and land options are predictable expenses in any development operation. In several of the instances where low income housing development has been undertaken, the inability to absorb these costs during delays in funding has caused the project to fail. Although these expenses would normally be paid by the development loans which are obtained, they will usually be incurred before the loan is procured, so that a special fund for these expenses will have to be provided for as part of the development corporation's original grant. Since these development expenses are recoverable out of subsequent loan monies, this expense fund would be replenished as loans are secured. Based on the experience of private developers, development costs of this nature will run less than 1 percent, projecting a commitment of $10 million (1,250 houses at $8,000, including land costs and improvements); $40,000 would therefore be sufficient for this expense fund. It is further estimated that no more than 20 percent, or $8,000, would be used for expenses which would be nonrecoverable. These include options for land that is not ultimately developed, and application fees for applications that do not receive financing. The expense fund, to that extent, would have to be replenished by additional grants and aids, or from surpluses realized by the development corporation at later stages of development (these costs might be passed on to renters or purchasers of the low cost housing).

2. *Private loan funds*

In addition to seeking Federal financing, the corporation will explore methods for generating private capital investment in low income housing projects. It is recognized that the greatest part of the funds will be sought from Federal sources. Nevertheless, in some instances private funds may be available and should not be ignored. If it can be demonstrated that private investment can receive a reasonable return in the low income housing market, a long-standing barrier to expansion of this market will have been partially overcome.

Two basic techniques are suggested. In each instance these should be seen as experimental, designed to explore what will be effective and what will not. The money in each fund is considered interchangeable, so that if one method works and the other does not, all of the capital monies available can be directed to the successful method.

a. Interest fund

It is anticipated that private lenders might be willing to enter into the low income field if the interest rate warranted the assumption of the risks involved. At the present time the standard loans at 7 percent for no longer than 10 years involve monthly payments beyond what can be absorbed, even by farmworkers in the $3,000 to $4,000 bracket. Conversations with lenders, however, indicate that longer terms might be negotiated if the interest rate were increased. For example, if an additional 2 or 3 percent on a 7 percent loan could be absorbed for the first 5 years, a 20-year loan to a low income borrower might be negotiated. On a $7,400 house, payments would be less than $900 a year. Assuming 25 percent of income as rent, this would allow persons earning $4,000 a year to use such a lending source.

A fund of $90,000 is sought for this purpose. Such a fund could provide interest supplements for almost 100 houses. It is, of course, recognized that this is a subsidy and not a permanent system of financing. It is directed, however, at getting private sources into the market and developing a body of experience which will increase their willingness to continue in this area. In each instance the payments by the corporation will be picked up by the farmworker, or renegotiated with the private lenders after 5 years.

b. The mortgage insurance fund

In addition to the interest fund, the development corporation would establish a fund with which to guarantee private lending institutions against loss for loans granted to approved buyers. The fund would be similar to Federal Housing Administration insurance. Each dollar in the FHA reserve fund currently supports approximately $50 in insured loans. Based on studies done in Philadelphia, it is estimated that each dollar of the guarantee fund could support between $20 to $50 of mortgage loans. This conforms to experience in other cities. The Pittsburgh Action Housing Development Fund, for example, has raised $5 million by lending only $430,000—of which $206,000 has been returned to its revolving fund for further use.

Thus far there is no data or experience with which to estimate losses which might occur in such a program because such a program has never been tried. The overall actual loss experience of the Federal Housing Administration has remained below 7/10 of 1 percent; Farmers Home Administration has had losses of less than 3/10 of percent. Even though the development corporation would be going into loans with more risk potential than those made by Farmers Home Administration, a reasonably conservative policy would undoubtedly be able to keep losses to no more than 5 percent of the money in the mortgage insurance fund, or approximately 16 times as large a loss experience as that encountered by the Farmers Home Administration.

How much new low cost housing could be generated by this insurance fund? Assuming an average house unit priced at $7,400, and a reserve ratio of 20 to 1, a guarantee fund of $90,000 would produce over 240 loans, or a total of $1,800,000. Although again the amount of additional housing is not large, it does represent private financing of 25 percent of the homes to be built in the first year. (See discussion in part V of this proposal.) This not only adds to the experience of the private investor in this area, but permits demonstration of the feasibility of such an insurance fund which could subsequently lead to the creation of a much larger fund and the construction of far more low cost units. To commence this experiment, an insurance fund of $90,000 is therefore sought.

Part of the mortgage insurance fund will also be available to guarantee a percentage of State and Federal loan programs, where such guarantees are appropriate and offer the possibility of liberalizing such public loan policies.

While the mortgage terms theoretically available under such programs as the Federal Housing Administration Section 221 (d) (2) program offer the liberal financing needed by home purchasers in the lower income brackets, many families cannot qualify for such mortgages because they did not meet FHA's stringent credit requirements or because the homes they wish to purchase do not meet with FHA approval. It is possible that FHA would be willing to adopt more liberal loan policies if it could be reinsured on mortgage loans which the FHA would ordinarily be unwilling to undertake. If one dollar of the fund could support a number of guaranteed mortgage dollars, on the theory that not all the loans would go bad, considerable leverage could be produced. Assuming a 20 to 1 reserve ratio ($20 reinsured for every $1 in the fund), the fund could run 20 times the value of the guarantees. If an arrangement could be made with Federal agencies whereby reinsurance was made with only part of the loans granted by Federal agencies, such as the top 25 percent, then each dollar of the fund could support $80 in mortgages.

C. *Income Development*

Loans for the creation and rehabilitation of low income housing will be of little help to low income families if they do not have incomes sufficient to repay the loans. Yet most programs dealing with problems of rural housing minimize the corollary problem of income development. The rapid advances in automation in employment in rural California make it impossible to deal any longer with low income housing in such narrow terms (15,000 persons who picked tomatoes during 1965 were replaced by machines during 1966). The introduction of mechanization in California agriculture is now proceeding so rapidly that Hirshen and Van der Ryn have estimated there will be no need for transient migrant labor housing within 5 years. If new means are not provided for families to earn income in rural areas, they will continue to move to the cities, and expand the urban slums.

There are potentially a number of sources, public and private, available to stimulate income development. In terms of the amount of rural poverty now existing, these are, of course, grossly inadequate. Nevertheless, even those resources that do exist are largely underutilized. An attempt is being made to provide this function through the community action agencies. But in rural areas these agencies are frequently lacking in the expertise to initiate and sustain economic development. As in the case of housing, professional assistance in packaging programs, in finding capital, and in negotiating with government agencies is needed.

One year is too short a time for the Rural Development Corporation to effectively develop a large number of income-producing programs, at the same time that it is planning and financing several large housing projects. One of the shortcomings of other development programs, we suggest, is that they may try to do many things at once, and may end up doing nothing well. We would therefore propose to turn more to the client community's income problem during the second year of operations of RDC. The first year would be reserved primarily for low cost housing. A discussion of income development is included in this proposal in order to suggest the complexity and interrelatedness of problems facing the rural poor, and to indicate that solution of these problems will require several years of work, and a variety of approaches. Some of these approaches are outlined below.

1. *Increasing income by employment training*

A basic means of income generation is retraining the unemployed and underemployed. The farm laborer works only approximately one-third to one-half of the year. Not covered by unemployment insurance, he earns no income in the remaining months. Especially near the larger towns and cities there are employment opportunities for the skilled worker in automobile repairs, housing and public works construction, food processing, and so forth. It is estimated that the corporation will assist communities in developing manpower programs pursuant to State and Federal legislation. These include:

Neighborhood Youth Corps programs under Title I, Part B of the Economic Opportunity Act;

On-the-job training programs under the Manpower Development and Training Act;

Vocation rehabilitation under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act; and

Work experience programs under Title V of the Economic Opportunity Act.

There may be significant possibilities for training opportunities in small appliance repairs (i.e., toasters, electric irons), major appliance repairs (dishwashers, dryers, automatic washers), automotive repair (mechanic's helper, service station attendant), vending machine maintenance, and food services (cook, salad girl).

In addition, attempts could be made to obtain funds for adult basic education, prevocational training, and health services where such programs are supportive of manpower development.

2. *Increasing income through business development*

More fundamental to income development will be the encouragement of small businesses. Since rural areas have large stretches of open land available for development, comprehensive communities can be planned, which can include commercial centers as well as houses. Conceivably, these businesses can employ and be managed by the poor, as well as serving the poor as consumers. A multiplier effect would be produced, stimulating not only new job opportunities but also additional capital investment. The additional income might enable some people to purchase housing in the community.

What sources are available for such expansion? By and large, public and private resources for business development in rural areas have not been fully utilized. Loans up to $25,000 for 15 years at market interest rates are available under Section 401 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. In addition, businesses qualifying under this title may have their leases for commercial or industrial property guaranteed by the Small Business Administration. Other small businesses may receive regular business loans under the Small Business Act of 1953. Private, commercial, or industrial financing may also be available: Foundations, labor unions, and chambers of commerce are all potential sources of funds. Where the amount sought is less than $2,500, 15-year loans at 4.8 percent are available from the Farmers Home Administration economic opportunity loan program.

The public sources of funds mentioned above have not been available partly because of the absence of expertise to assist the low income applicants. Applications require an analysis of the economic growth of the area, estimates of cost-profit ratios to demonstrate likelihood of repayment, an analysis of the capitalization of the business, and an assessment of the management capacity of the applicant—which often exceeds the background and competence of the applicant. While the economic opportunity loan program requires the establishment of Small Business Development Centers to provide assistance in screening, preparing, and processing loan applications, very few of such centers have been established in rural California. The Rural Development Corporation could provide assistance in setting up SBDC's throughout the State and thereby guarantee a resource for extensive expansion of the public commitment of small business developments.

With respect to private sources of funds, a different approach seems to be needed. In some instances technical assistance and negotiation will enable an applicant to secure a loan otherwise unavailable. By and large, however, private capital has been unavailable because it has assessed the risk of investment as being too high to warrant expenditure of capital. To deal with this, demonstrations of cost effectiveness and risk reductions must be made. In selected areas, the Rural Development Corporation could seek public grant-in-aid funds or loans to set up nonprofit businesses, with stock held by the employees or members of the low income consumer community. Such businesses could operate under careful direction and guidance, would rely heavily on outside consultant services, and would provide additional training for its employees whenever necessary. As the businesses expand, stock may be distributed more broadly to the entire community and eventually the enterprises might be placed on a profit-making basis. The value of such enterprises lies not only in their economic potential, but in their commitment to participation of the poor in economic growth. It seems to us that this is the most meaningful definition of the concept of "maximum feasible participation" embodied in the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

A variety of businesses might be developed. In its publication on "Local Enterprise Through Community Action Agencies," the Office of Economic Opportunity suggests as possible businesses: "restaurants, shoe repair shops, service stations, beauty parlors, barber shops, auto repair shops, day nurseries, domestic help, laundry services." In Washington, D.C., manufacturing enterprises have contracted for short-term job services such as cutting or stuffing plastic or metal from machine-stamped products, collating printed matter, and assembling items for distribution in the advertising business.

3. *Increasing income through credit assistance*

Closely tied to income development, through employment and business enterprises, is the problem of financing. To sustain its need for consumer goods, a family must borrow money, either directly or through retail installment sales financing at the same time that it is repaying its housing loan. According to most studies, the poor pay excessively for consumer credit and for the goods purchased with it. Any lowering of the costs of commercial credit could free dollars for the purchase or rental of housing.

It is, of course, essential to seek reasonable financing from every available source. The profit on such financing, however, does not necessarily add to the income of the low income community itself. Nor is there assurance that the returned capital will be reinvested in the growth of the community. To achieve these ends, credit for housing and economic development would have to be supplied by institutions controlled by the low income community itself.

The Rural Development Corporation could develop two kinds of credit institutions which would be controlled by the poor.

a. Community credit unions.

Credit unions could be established in areas where housing is being expanded. Insurance for credit union loans is available under the Federal Credit Union Act, which authorizes the chartering of such organizations to make loans at 12 percent. Staff could be supplied from the Office of Economic Opportunity. In other parts of the country, credit unions with accumulated assets in excess of $5 million have been formed. Five percent of these unions are specifically geared to serve low income groups.

The credit unions could make individual loans to people, assist them in debt and budget management and train them so that they could manage the credit union. California Rural Legal Assistance's programs in legal education have focused recently on consumer problems, and could be utilized in developing sophistication in the client community on saving income through credit and consumer management.

b. Regional credit and community development corporation.

Credit unions in low income communities will, by themselves, have little impact on economic growth. They are often undercapitalized, poorly managed, and committed to loan policies which are rarely more than loan supplements. The statute itself, in limiting unsecured loans to $750, tends to foster this. Without increased capitalization and loan policies geared to business growth, they offer little hope of income development.

The Rural Development Corporation should therefore explore the possibilities of merging existing credit unions or of creating new credit unions on a statewide or regional basis. Such credit unions would experiment with modifications or changes in policies currently followed by existing credit unions. For example, standardized or even automated banking procedures might be instituted, and repayment schedules might be geared to the actual working patterns of farm labor. (The present practice of monthly repayments is unsuited to the sporadic earning patterns of farmworkers.)

In addition, such credit unions could seek funds from sources outside its membership, for the purpose of making the types of business and housing loans discussed in the preceding sections. Businesses, banks, and industrial enterprises in the communities might be asked to make investments, and foundations and public and private agencies might be persuaded to make grants. Such a community development credit union might qualify as an "economic stimulation" project or an "economic opportunity project" under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965. Funds might also be available under Section 502 of the Small Business Act of 1953, which authorizes SBA to channel such loans through community development funds. In addition, discussions could also be entered into with the Federal Credit Union Administration, to seek authority to use membership funds for growth investment. In Washington, D.C., membership funds from nine credit unions in low income areas totaled over $200,000.

Given such a capital base, these regional community development credit unions could themselves become approved FHA mortgagors, making loans guaranteed by the programs of the Federal Housing Administration and the Farmers Home Administration. For example, Section 203 (k) loans for long-term (20 years) home improvement, at 6 percent could be made. Such loans would be resold to out-of-State lenders and to the Federal National Mortgage Association, thereby replacing the cash outlaid. This would be repeated again and again.

Large credit unions could also develop funds for insuring private and public housing loans, using some of the methods described in this proposal's section on capital formation. This is not to minimize the difficulty in developing such institutions and the high degree of risk in the operations envisioned. Essentially what is contemplated is a regional or statewide bank focusing on the economic growth of the low income market. The pitfalls in this are obvious. Nevertheless, such techniques offer potential for change not available in the traditional welfare-oriented approach to poverty. They ought, at least, to be explored.

4. *Increasing income through the expansion of the housing supply*

Another possibility for income development lies in the manufacture of low cost housing by the poor themselves. If such houses are constructed with prefabricated components in factories located in the rural areas, an enormous employment and training potential is opened up.

Assume, for an illustration, that one of the housing projects developed chooses to use the prototype design by Hirshen and Van der Ryn. Small contracting firms might be persuaded to hire poor people to set up the units. Or a small factory, hiring poor people, might prefabricate the modules used in the house.

The Southern Alameda Spanish-Speaking Organization (SASSO) has prepared a proposal for technical assistance to conduct necessary preliminary planning and market research for developing a small factory to produce the plumbing and mechanical systems cores which will be used in the type of kit-house previously discussed. Financing for the factory, or for another developed by RDC, might be obtained from a number of sources. Section 101 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 provides grants and loans for development of new industry and permanent jobs in redevelopment areas. Another potential source of funds for the factory is the experimental housing program authorized under Section 233 of the Housing Act of 1961, which authorizes grants to nonprofit corporations to use new techniques in construction of low income housing to reduce housing costs or to improve housing standards. It is also possible that Section 207 of the Housing Act of 1961, the low income housing demonstration program, could be utilized. The object of this program is to support demonstrations of new or improved means of providing low income housing. Under LIHD, outright grants for technical research and development, as well as "bricks and mortar" funds, are available.

5. *Increasing income through public works construction*

There is also potential for employment in the construction of sewer, water, and other facilities that must necessarily accompany the construction of housing.

Loans are available through the Office of Economic Development of the Department of Commerce and the Community Facilities Administration of the Department of Housing and Urban Development under authority of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, for the provision of highways, sewage treatment, water works, and so forth. In addition, Section 201 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 authorizes mortgage insurance for land development, including water supply, sewerlines, roads, streets, sidewalks, drainage facilities, and other related installations. Such projects must have local government approval. The staff of the Rural Development Corporation could provide local authorities with technical assistance in securing such financing where such public works were needed in connection with one of the RDC projects.

IV. PERSONNEL

A. *The Board of Trustees*

To be capable of attracting financing, a project must be well designed. Even with proper formulation, however, it is still the reputation of the people involved in the development which the financing sources will look to in deciding whether to approve the loan applications. Basic to the Economic Development Corporation, then, is the role of its board of trustees.

Sound judgment, extensive expertise, and capable management will not be easily achieved by a board of monumental size. We would begin with a board of 15 members, of which 2 to 3 will be executives of successful real estate development corporations; 1, an executive of a savings and loan association; 1 or 2, lawyers experienced in real estate and municipal law; 1, a local government official; 1, an official of a building trades union; 1, a real estate economist; and 5 will be representatives from the rural poverty community. As the development program progresses, and contacts are needed in other areas, the board can be expanded. At all times a third of the board members will be representatives of the poverty community.

In addition to the doors which such a board should be able to open, the board will also be a source of many ideas and, once the programs are developed, can provide a preliminary critique of them. The board members should also be able to locate highly qualified persons who could fill the corporation's full-time positions.

Organization of the 15-man board is proceeding in two stages. In the first phase, the articles of incorporation of the development corporation have been prepared and filed with the secretary of state, the corporation has been formally incorporated, the corporation's prospectus has been composed, conversations have been held with more than 30 real estate experts, and 10 of them have been asked for expressions of their willingness and intention to serve on the initial board. Specific expressions of interest have been received from 7 men, listed in the letter accompanying this prospectus; it is planned that they will serve as charter members of the board, which will be organized in its entirety of 15 members by the end of March 1967. The careful, considered formation of the board should proceed at the same time as the submission of the applications to the Office of Economic Opportunity, we believe, so that the prospective board members will know exactly what they are getting into before any final commitment is made by RDC and OEO.

B. *Administrative Staff*

The corporation's major concern in its early efforts should be with the quality, rather than quantity, of its staff. During the first year of experiment, when there is no assurance that extensive financing will be available, it would seem precipitous to form a large-scale bureaucracy. Rather, a substantial percentage of the corporation's funds should be preserved as seed money (loan guarantees, loan insurance, and payment of interest rates), in order to generate additional capital in the following years.

The corporation's staff will be headed by an executive director who will be responsible for the overall management and administration of the program, including negotiations with State, local and Federal authorities, review and formulation of plans and policies, and supervision of the staff of the corporation. It is expected that he will have extensive experience in private real estate development or Federal agency financing, as well as technical construction or engineering background. He should be familiar with housing construction in California and with governmental programs dealing with it. The corporation will probably attempt to recruit such a person on a leave-of-absence basis from his regular employment, since even with private funds he would have to take a substantial cut in pay to undertake the job.

The corporation will also be staffed by an attorney, a financial analyst, a project developer, and a community relations specialist.

The attorney will analyze the statutes and regulations relevant to the projects undertaken by the corporation, draft documents and articles needed to establish the legal arrangements among buyers and financiers, handle negotiations with governmental commissions, represent the corporation in all its own legal, tax, and contract matters, and recommend, where appropriate, administrative or legislative changes which are needed to expand the low income housing market. It is expected that the corporation not only will work within the existing legal structure, but also will examine, evaluate, and seek to change those rules that create difficulties or delay in the construction of low cost housing.

The financial analyst will undertake surveys of financial institutions, initiate and supervise financial and market feasibility studies, and provide the primary continuing contract with commercial banks, savings and loan associations, and governmental financing agencies. The various financing mechanisms outlined in the proposal must be continually modified and reevaluated. In addition, new capital sources and techniques for expanding the existing fund must be exploited. Lastly, income projections, balance sheet analyses, and credit review must be continually done for RDC and for the nonprofit corporations which it establishes.

The project developer will put together the written proposals developed by the staff, maintain a library of materials and data on housing and income development, write guides and handbooks for organizations and groups seeking to use governmental programs, conduct selected research studies where an area of development is under consideration, and provide direct technical assistance to credit unions, small businesses, housing and income expansion. It is expected that he will have technical background in the business of economic development and practical experience in program development and planning. The program developer will provide the central link with the regional law offices of California Rural Legal Assistance and will assist them through guidance, consultation, and training in performing these functions through the regions. Rather than have a large program development staff, RDC will work closely with the CRLA attorneys and community workers. The offices of CRLA are already beginning to shift their focus from litigation to institution building. A staff of over 70 people is therefore available to provide a supplementary resource for program development.

The fifth member of the full-time staff will be a community relations director, who will be the corporation's primary contact with the low income community and will be charged with the responsibility of involving this community, to the greatest extent possible, in the projects of the corporation. This will involve contact with local groups, participation in community education programs, work with the self-help housing staff, tenants, councils, and community action agencies. It is expected that he will be able to work directly with community organization efforts that must supplement any cooperative housing effort. He should have extensive experience in community organization, and in working with the poor in rural California.

There are many other talents which the development corporation will need, such as architectural and environmental planning, engineering surveys, market analyses, and public relations work. These additional services may involve special equipment, a large separate office staff and, potentially, a large additional overhead. On analysis it seems that none of these specialists, will be in demand so frequently and continually that they, and their equipment, need be purchased on a full-time basis. In view of the salaries which these specialists can normally expect, such full-time employment would therefore be needlessly expensive, and wasteful. Moreover, it is doubtful whether highly qualified specialists in these areas would be willing to give up their current businesses for a full-time commitment with another organization. Consequently, all of these supplementary needs will be satisfied through consulting arrangements.

C. *Development of Expertise*

This prospectus assumes that successful private developers will be equally successful in the public sector. However, it would be misleading to suggest that publicly-financed low cost projects will be carbon copies of private developments. Involved in the changeover from private to public must be a great deal of testing and learning. If a specialty is to be created, new specialists must be trained. The universities seem to be the logical place to turn for assistance.

George Lefcoe, a real estate law specialist at the University of Southern California Law School has offered to teach a special seminar on the legal problems which arise in the real estate development corporation. A selected group of third-year law students would study particular problems, would learn about the operations and management of the corporation, and after the school year had ended would work for the corporation. Under the direction of Mr. Lefcoe, the law school seminar could also be used to provide particularized training for staff members. He will also supervise and direct the research and practical work of the students, to maximize its benefits to the corporation.

With the USC seminar as a model, similar study groups could then be undertaken in other law schools, government departments, schools of social work, business schools, and schools of public administration. As many as 100 people, it has been estimated, could be involved in studying the problem of low income housing—but only after the relevant issues have been stated and focused upon by the experience of the development corporation.

V. THE END RESULT:
THE BEGINNING OF NEW TOWNS IN RURAL AREAS

Thus far, this proposal has primarily restricted itself to the problem of how rural development can be accomplished, rather than how much of it can be achieved. The quantitative aspects of the problem are also important, however. How many housing units can be financed in the first year of operation? How many people can be helped? How many communities can be affected?

Most of the development corporations thus far proposed speak of developing loan applications for housing projects involving from 50 to 100 units. Assuming that such a corporation, acting as a developer from start to finish, can put together four or five complete projects in any one year, the corporation would be able to finance construction of 250 to 500 housing units, which at $7,400 per unit would be worth a total of $1,850,000 to $3,700,000. With an initial funding of $350,000, a corporation would thus be able to generate 6 to 12 times its worth in low cost housing. At the same time, of course, the corporation would seek to act as a catalyst in a number of other areas, encouraging separate organizations to undertake similar programs.

Such an approach, at least for rural areas, attempts both too little and too much, we believe. It tends to underestimate the quantity of housing which can be directly generated and overestimates the number of well-designed plans which other organizations will be assisted in developing. This latter observation can only be verified by experience, but the former conclusion can be further documented.

Based on the experience of California developers, it is almost as expensive to plan a project of 50 to 100 units as it is to put together one of 1,250 units. Assuming that small projects totaling 300 units were attempted and a development corporation were capitalized at $300,000, the corporation would be expending $1,000 in its own funds for every house financed—which appears to be an inefficient use of the corporation's resources. Reliance on such limited development, moreover, would mean that development corporation would barely begin to meet the needs of the poor in rural California.

In urban areas, where land is more scarce, small-scale development is to be expected. But in rural areas which contain vast stretches of open land, the opportunity exists for more ambitious development of perhaps as many as 1,250 units in any one project.

Studies have indicated that many farmworkers travel as much as 100 miles to and from work each day. Vacancies in a housing development of 1,250 units could thereby be filled by people working in a radius of as much as 50 miles from the project. Although further market research should be done, initial estimates indicate that at least three areas of rural California (Imperial County, Kern-Tulare Counties, and Stanislaus-San Joaquin Counties) have high enough densities and mobility patterns to achieve this potential.

If five developments of 1,250 units could be financed each year, over 6,000 units would be added to the housing supply. Of course, each of these large clusters would be planned so that construction would be done in phases, and thereby financed in several parts, in recognition of the fact that in the near future only limited Federal appropriations may be available. It is estimated that 250 houses in each project of 1,250 houses, or a total of 1,250 units in five projects, could be financed in the first year, with 20 percent of the financing coming from private sources. Thus, whereas existing development corporations might generate 9 to 12 times their value in new funds, RDC would seek initial financing of $9,250,000 in grants and loans (1,250 housing units × $7,400 per unit) or over 25 times its initial capitalization of $365,000; and RDC would develop plans for 12,500 units in five projects, calling for $46,250,000, or some 125 times its capitalization. Only by this approach, we believe, can we begin to meet the enormous need for low cost housing.

The development of large projects involves a number of other advantages, as well. Investigation, planning, and negotiation which might lead to construction of 1,250 units rather than 100 would make each hour of the corporation's work-time far more profitable and productive. By undertaking large projects, RDC would enable the rural people to live in separate communities, which are unconnected with existing slums. The communities would be comprehensively planned from start to finish, and include community centers, recreational facilities, a church, and even industrial plants. Not only might these other land uses generate income for the residents, they would also make possible a variety of living experiences which would be inconceivable in smaller projects. Future expansion would also be provided for, so that what is created is a community which can grow rather than a static housing project. The new rural "towns" would be large enough and varied enough to allow for research and evaluation of experiments in rural community development. Such new "towns" could conceivably qualify as demonstration cities, under the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966.

This is not to ignore or minimize the difficulties of development of this scope. The "garden city," a comprehensively planned community of 5,000 to 30,000 people, was originally proposed by Ebenezer Howard, a noted English planner. That concept, in one form or another, has been supported by Le Corbusier, Frank Lloyd Wright, Patrick Bel Geddes, and Howard Mumford, all of whom have been creative forces in the architecture and planning of the twentieth century. Yet, with the exception of the new towns constructed in Britain following World War II, their dream has remained largely unrealized, primarily because most housing developments have involved little more than unplanned expansion of the cities. Nonetheless, there still exists in the open land of rural America the possibility of creating new towns and better communities.

Such a hope cannot be completely discounted as rural romanticism. A few private developers are developing "new towns" in California, in the Canejo Valley, at Rossmor Leisure World, and in the Santa Monica Mountains. In November 1966, the Congress of the United States passed a demonstration cities legislation which makes possible the development of comprehensively planned communities. As recently as June 9, 1966, the Secretary of Agriculture spoke out against the present trend toward massive concentration of people in this nation's cities, and called for the adoption of a Rural Development District Bill, which would begin to renew the countryside. The prospect has been held out, but can we take advantage of it? This question, above all else, remains to be answered.

Mr. **HENDERSON**: Now, Mr. Lorenz, both you and Mr. Lund are lawyers?

Mr. **LORENZ**: I am a lawyer, and Mr. Lund has had one year of law school and will be going back next year.

Mr. **HENDERSON**: All right, questions of the Commission, and I will recognize Mr. Gay.

Mr. **GAY**: I hope that you will not misinterpret the question I am about to ask and I hope no one else in this room will misinterpret what I am about to ask.

I am asking because I live in the East and in the Virgin Islands, and all I know is what I read in the papers.

I read in the papers that you have somewhat of a political change out in California, starting at the top; and I see some of your California political figures on television, even in the Virgin Islands because we get films down there.

I get the feeling that some of these people that I see on TV that are on television in California do not want these—well, I heard a man say that he didn't want these poor people and these underprivileged people and so on and so forth—in other words, they do not want people to be poor and underprivileged.

I got the idea that some of these up-and-at-them programs of the past few years may be looked at with a little jaundiced eye because of some political changes out there.

Is that true? And, if so, what effect will this have in the next 3 or 4 years in that particular area? Now, I am not limiting it to California, because we have a lot of changes in other areas taking place in the South and in some of the other sections; that is, there are many areas where these vast changes have taken place in the top leadership as far as political philosophy and social philosophy is concerned.

What are you going to run into there?

Mr. **LORENZ**: Well, I should say at the outset—and I guess a short answer is what I should give, because I do not have expertise in this area or anything approaching it and I could not even speculate intelligently as to the intentions of the present State administration in California—but I do not want to appear to pass the buck completely.

I would suggest that there is general discontent and a critical view of much of the poverty program by those of us who are in it as well as by those of us who are out of it.

I have the feeling that mainly business development is perhaps the common ground between so-called conservatives and so-called liberals. Business development is something that business can understand. We are talking about houses and jobs and things like that, and those may have a distinct multiplier effect upon the economy.

It is not social services, it is not what some people may view as agitation such as picketing and things like that. It is hard dollars-and-cents reasoning.

In my limited experience in talking to some very conservative elements in California during the past month, they are very interested in this kind of a program. I think this could be consistent—I am not saying that it is—but I think it could be consistent with Mr. Reagan's creative society.

Mr. HENDERSON: Is there another question?

Mr. FISCHER: I have a question.

Are you thinking of building new rural communities out in the open land from scratch where people will be employed mostly in agriculture; or do you think in terms of already existing small communities?

Mr. LORENZ: Well, to answer your first question—well, yes, existing small communities could be used as bases.

For example, if you are going to increase the demonstration city's money, you are going to have to have an existing unit to attach it to, but you can find a number of communities throughout the State of California that would qualify for that.

You would be creating substantially a new community in reality.

You really have gotten into a critical issue and one we have not touched on at all, and that is income, and it is discussed to some degree in the second part of our proposal.

Very briefly, we feel that you have to look at that problem as well as housing, because people have to have money to buy houses with. It is pretty clear that a lot of farmers have automated several workers out of existence and that new jobs are going to have to be created. This means getting small industries in, stabilizing the work force, guaranteeing some kind of acceptable wage structure for these people; and, perhaps attaching small industries to these developments would be one way, and also including commercial developments in these housing units. We anticipate that, to begin with, you could create a development of 1,250 houses, attach a shopping center to that, and it is conceivable that, as well as serving the occupants of the community, you could also employ occupants.

So, you should have job generation if you are going to begin to solve this problem.

A lot of work has to be done, a lot of sophisticated work on new careers, a lot better work than we have seen so far, and which we are capable of doing right now.

Mr. HENDERSON: I think there was some mention in the presentation about a $3,500 house, and this strikes me—because one of the problems we have in this whole housing field is the whole question of housing technology. And while I can see the possibility of someone—if there is a market for large-scale global housing, somebody could create a low income house. It would take the technologists, architects, engineers, and so forth, and they may come up with that. And you are saying that they have already come up with it?

Mr. LORENZ: But they have not done it in any kind of a package yet. They constructed single units; and, in this case, the Berkeley architects did it in their own backyard. I have seen the house, and this is a good house.

Mr. HENDERSON: You know, in New York, they are putting in a 48-hour reconstruction—well, within 48 hours, they are restructuring the ghetto, have you seen that?

Mr. LORENZ: No, sir.

Mr. HENDERSON: This engineer has shown that this can be done in 48 hours.

Mr. LORENZ: Well, does that mean completely rebuilding a building, or just what does it mean?

Mr. HENDERSON: Well, there are a lot of things which I do not care to go into at this time, but it would bring about a real change, I know that.

Mr. LORENZ: Well, did you hear what happened in Harlem on that?

Mr. HENDERSON: What happened?

Mr. LORENZ: Well, I understand the unions would not hook it up, but they ——

Mr. HENDERSON (interrupting): Well, I know about that problem. But, I am simply interested in the overall operation from the architectural and engineering stage, from that phase of it.

Mr. LORENZ: Well, I am just raising the question with regard to some of the problems we have to deal with. One of those problems is that you are contemplating development which may be inconsistent with unions, and all of these problems do exist in one way or another, even in rural areas.

Mr. HENDERSON: Yes, I realize that, and I am so interested that we are letting the time get away with us.

Mr. FISCHER: Mr. Lorenz, while you are in Tucson, you might want to look at a housing project which is going up on the outskirts here. They are building them basically themselves of adobe and it is Yaqui housing.

They are getting very respectable looking houses.

Mr. LORENZ: I would very much like to see that.

Mr. HENDERSON: We are just simply going to have to move along.

We thank you very much for presenting us with the information you have given us, and your presentation will be completely incorporated in the record.

We thank both of you very much.

Mr. LORENZ: It was our pleasure to be here, sir.

Mr. LUND: Thank you, gentlemen.

Mr. HENDERSON: The Commission will now hear from Rev. Henry Casso who is on the Bishops' Committee for the Spanish Speaking, San Antonio, Tex.

I might at this time announce the fact that we will also hear from Rev. William Welsh from Kingman, Ariz.; and from Elizabeth Clark, and they both will be heard before we close.

I would like to say that we are happy to have you with us, Reverend Casso, and I assure you we did not put you at the tail end because we had no interest in what you have to say; it is simply the way the logistics work out.

Mr. CASSO: Perhaps it is because I am so long winded.

Mr. HENDERSON: We have held the time down as much as possible and we would appreciate your summarizing as much as you are able to do because we still have two other people to get on the program and there are others whom we will not be able to hear from at all.

This has been an extremely short period of time in which to cover so much ground.

At any rate, you may proceed, Reverend Casso.

Mr. CASSO: All right.

STATEMENT OF HENRY J. CASSO

Mr. Casso: I am Rev. Henry J. Casso, of the Bishop's Committee for the Spanish Speaking, Suite 205, 5511 South Pedro Avenue, San Antonio, Tex.

Mr. Chairman, members of the National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty, may I first express my warmest gratitude for your invitation to express my views and recommendations relating to the Presidential Executive Order 11306, especially in reference to the problems and policy as affecting our fellow Americans of Mexican descent in rural areas.

Although it gladdens my heart to be able to assist in this, the first of your three important hearings dealing with rural poverty, I find no delight in bringing to you in public the "badge of infamy" that each of us must wear as citizens of these, our United States. May I inject here, as this presentation unfolds, you and I must remember that I speak of people, many of whom have been exploited for 100 years. No other people, with whom the U.S. has waged war, have been subjected to such devastating humiliations. Historically every country with whom we have engaged in battle has been helped economically toward its uplifting. But here in the five Southwestern States we find abject poverty, illiteracy, misery.

For fear that I present my individual opinions I have turned to more intelligent minds who have studied and written of these matters. Much of this is the basis for my presentation since I also feel that each of these sources are authorities in themselves. I would further wish to show by this method that information already is had by various agencies, commissions, and departments. Further information is good, but what is needed more is determination, concern, commitments, sincerity, and action.

Two of the greatest factors for our economic and social plight in the rural areas of the Southwest are poverty and illiteracy. For a description of the poverty of the Southwest I would recommend that you refer to the remarks and observations of Dr. William Crook, former regional director for the War on Poverty in this region. He did not mince words in expressing his anguish and shock at the conditions that he had just personally witnessed in the rural areas of the Southwest.

Your Commission has been founded at a unique point in history, since action *must* be your course. On the one hand, you have our President who recently told the Nation, "We must develop our rural areas since our cities are becoming too congested." And yet on the other hand, from the State of Texas alone, the home base of the migrant farmworker, the backbone of agriculture, one can see an increase from 129,000 migrants in 1964 to 165,000 in 1965. Causes of this are contained in an article that I recently wrote regarding the farmworkers' march from Rio Grande City to Austin, Tex. I have incorporated references to this in this report. The chief cause of this is poverty and illiteracy.

I mention that contributing factors are illiteracy and poverty; therefore, let us look a moment at the educational picture which reflects itself in the economic conditions treated later.

Education

The median measures of both schooling and income in urban areas are roughly twice as large as the corresponding figures for people in rural farm residence.

Southwest, Place of Residence 1960

	Grades Completed	Median Income
All	8.1	$2,801
Urban	8.4	3,197
Rural nonfarm	6.9	1,871
Rural farm	4.6	1,531

It is indeed a phenomenon that in the 120 years of the U. S. domination of what is known today as the Southwestern States, it is only in our day that bold attempts are being made educationally to rectify a grave national neglect in the education of the Americans of Mexican descent, especially those whose language is not English. In the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, the U. S. committed herself not to deprive the inhabitants of these States (formerly belonging to Mexico) of their language and customs. Yet throughout the Southwest, more especially in the rural areas, we have seen our children segregated in separate schools, retained in the first grade for 2 or 3 years, severely punished for the use of their mother language, and only now are they able to see a gleam of hope that their first language (for many—whether some of us will admit it or not) is being recognized as a fact, an asset rather than as a degrading defect or handicap.

Dr. Ralph Guzman, assistant director of the Mexican-American Study Project, University of California, was recorded as saying at the preplanning session of the Mexican-American White House Conference, ". . . it is easier for someone from India or Africa, notwithstanding their language barriers, than a Mexican American to get scholarships into our colleges." (This is so even if they have low scoring points.)

What hope for the future in rectifying this situation in education will depend on the willingness to take a bold step in the stronger and more meaningful education, especially of our migrants and rural seasonal farmworkers who, by the way, are the chief source of Spanish-speaking increase moving into the urban areas. Up to now our nation has depended on an illiterate as the backbone for our agricultural industry. How many of us condemn him for his condition, yet in truth from all appearances in our present economy this condition was needed.

The educational statistic for the Spanish speaking in the urban Southwest most assuredly is bleak. It is, however, vastly better than that for the children of migrant and seasonal farmworkers, as indicated above.

Migration to the Northern States begins in the spring before the school term ends, and return to the Southwest is not until months after school has reopened in the fall. The migrant child may move every few days or weeks.

It has been estimated that more than 50 percent of the school-age migrants in the nation are from 1 to 4 years behind in school by the time they reach the age of 14. Seventy-five percent of the school-age migrants in Colorado each farm season are Spanish speaking; 67 percent or more are retarded in age-grade status; 95 percent are socially retarded; and 90 percent of them need to make up school work. Almost three-fourths of these children speak Spanish as the chief language in the home, and 14 percent do not speak English at all. In Texas, approximately 80 to 90 percent of the migrant children know little English.

One must keep in mind that in many rural communities, up to 16 years our youngsters were not allowed into some schools.

It is well known that the national educational program sponsored by the OEO is making tremendous strides in this area especially in the preschool programs which I recommend be continued and expanded. Notwithstanding the success, one must look at the report that in 1964 it was found that on 2,562 farms 7,972 minors under 16 were illegally employed during school hours; 20 percent, or 1,578, were age 9 or younger. More than half, or over 4,000, were 10 to 13 years of age.

During the 1965 fiscal year, 7,076 minors under 16 years of age were found illegally employed during school hours on 2,300 of the 3,599 farms that were investigated. Of these minors, 5,316 were local rural children and 1,760 were migrants. Over 20 percent (1,514) of the minors illegally employed were 9 years of age or younger. More than half (3,606) of the minors were 10 to 13 years of age, while 27 percent (1,929) were 14 and 15.

Preschool-age children were also working on farms. Their employment, however, is not a violation of the act since there are no "school hours" for them. A question I would like to pose, if these were the numbers found or reported, how many really are out of school? What is the real picture?

The educational handicap these child farmworkers suffer is reflected in information obtained from them regarding the last grade attended at school. Of the 6,934 children who furnished this information, 43 percent were in grades below the normal for their ages. As might be expected, educational achievement in relation to ages becomes lower as the children increase in age. Thus, at 14 years of age, 58 percent of the children employed in violation of that act were enrolled in grades below the normal for their ages, and at 15 years of age the percentage was 68.

Of the migrants found illegally employed, information on last grade completed was obtained from 1,661; 55 of these children had never attended school, and 70 percent were in grades below the normal. At 14 years of age the percentage increased to 88, and at 15 years, 91 percent were behind in scholastic attainment.

It is interesting to note that the State (Texas) from which the largest numbers of home-based migrants come had 1,277 violations of minors illegally employed of the total 7,076. For this State the breakdown, 14 to 15 years of age, 436; 10 to 13 years, 573; 9 years and under, 268.

A point of further study should be developed to see this last data in relationship to the percentage of home-based migrants and seasonal farmworkers as related to the grade level of the rural person of Mexican descent.

In 1965 between 20,000 and 25,000 preschool and school-age children throughout the nation were given supervised care, nourishing food, medical examinations, and immunizations.

According to the migrant OEO office, there were 30,000 migrant school children in 1965 and 45,000 in 1966. Note difference between Department of Labor and migrant OEO figures.

This seems like a lot, but when one considers there are 7½ million migrant and seasonal farmworkers and members of family, this becomes like a drop in the bucket. Who really knows the educational picture of the some 2 million children from these homes? These figures of 7½ and 2 million are from the migrant OEO office.

When one looks at the ill effect the national bracero program had upon the migrant and seasonal farmworker, the cost of this program in relation to the amount spent today for the native worker is most revealing. The bracero recruiting program from 1942 to 1945 was borne entirely by the Federal Government and was estimated at more than $5 million, only a part of which represented costs for agricultural recruitment. In 1952 the direct cost to the Department of Labor for administration was $2,735,000 and in 1956 it was $1,172,000. For the years 1951-59, Department appropriations directly connected with the Mexican labor program and not reimbursable totaled $17,733,000. To these direct costs were added those for personnel assigned by the immigration, public health, and State farm-placement services and State division of housing. Without these public contributions recruiting of Mexican labor could not have been carried on. From all that has been written, the bracero program was greatly responsible for many of our present-day woes in rural farm worker conditions, and in comparison, to remedy these in 1965 $15 million was allotted to migrant OEO; in 1966, $35 million; and in 1967 $33 million.

As to the attitude of the farmworkers themselves, this was well expressed at a 3-day conference on antipoverty programs for migrant and seasonal farmworkers attended by 300 people in Washington in mid-January of 1965. Education and related fields were important subjects. There is a felt need for better schools and teachers for children, better dealing with the language (particularly the Spanish) problem, adequate day care and preschool programs, and adult remedial and vocational schooling.

Migrant OEO 1965 data: Migrant school program, 30,000
Day care, 13,000 children
Adult, 28,000 (This may include children)

Estimated adult workers: Approximately 2 million migrant and seasonal farmworkers (Migrant OEO Office)

They demanded opportunities for OEO to finance education projects not related to existing schools and school systems. They want to be able to bypass either local school boards or State departments or both when necessary to provide the education they want and need. These people see their history of exclusion from meaningful opportunity and involvement as requiring unusual steps to raise themselves, and especially their children, to a higher level of achievement.

Speaking of the observations of the rural poverty representatives at this conference, their demands for new institutions over and beyond the present boards was quite clear. Obviously, however, they were not heard. It is understood that the 1966 budget of $35 million allocated to migrant OEO is to be reduced to $33 million for 1967. This I am told is to necessitate a transfer of child education from migrant OEO to Title 1 of the education department. This probably means lessening private nonprofit organizations' participation, notwithstanding the fact that in many instances had it not been for their participation many rural communities would not have these educational programs because of lack of interest on the part of school boards and school systems. Mathis, Tex., is a wonderful case in point.

Permit me to inject a recent case which will somewhat demonstrate the effects of lack of educational opportunity in our rural areas. (A recent case of a young rural lad from Wyoming entering Gary Job Corps Center in Texas.) The story of Leslie Garrison, near-illiterate, but gifted, began to unravel shortly after his arrival at the center. It was discovered that although Leslie had gone through eight grades at Shoshoni, Wyo., he could only read at first grade level. He pleaded to learn a trade and learn how to read. It was assumed that Leslie had a low mental capacity because he could not read. Because of his own insistence it was found that he was a near mathematical genius. Had he not insisted, his talent would not have been known and developed because of this blunder. If this happens to a young rural lad whose language is English, what happens and how often in the lives of our youngsters who, because of environment, have Spanish as their mother tongue?

Employment

Again we could repeat, if things are bleak in the urban life, how much darker is it in the rural situation regarding employment, employment opportunities, wages, and their relation to poverty? Because of the growing lack of these opportunities, low wages, and automation, a growing army of migrants are reaching into 48 of the 50 States of our nation.

From all reports, chiefly due to automation, there is a decrease in the availability of farmwork. Yet as the jobs decrease the "army on the move" increases with those seeking a hope where too often there is none. Permit me to use a portion of an article that I have recently written which can give a better understanding of this point.

According to the 1964–65 Texas migrant report, the known farmworkers in the migrant stream from the State of Texas total over 167,000 who call home-base some 38 counties from Bexar County to the south. This increase represents an overall increase from the previous year's report of 25 to 30 percent in all categories. The total increase into the migrant stream is up 30 percent, from 129,000 to 167,000. Total interstate migration is up 24 percent, 128,000 from 104,000. The total of families migrating is up from 18,000 to 23,700, 30 percent increase. Men 16 and over, up 30 percent, from 48,000 to 63,000. Women 16 and over, up 37.3 percent, from 35,000 to 46,000. Youths under 26, up 27 percent, from 46,000 to 58,000. School-age youths, up 26 percent, from 25,000 to 31,000. Unattached women, up 19 percent, from 1,600 to 1,900. Unattached men, up 18 percent, from 10,000 to 12,500.

These alarming increases are brought about by many factors that will continue to grow by leaps and bounds, furthering a whole army of people groping for decency of life and a bit of what America's democratic life has to offer for the dignity of her people. Automation is causing less need for the hand farmworker, seeing in the production of cotton alone in Texas during 1965, 91 percent of the Texas cotton crop harvested by machine. This forces people to leave their local residence and the State, migrating to such attractive working spots as California. However, here we see that across the State of California about a third of the 1965 tomato crop, i.e. 116,000 acres, was reaped by 262 machines. In 1966 a major portion of the tomatoes was planted for machine harvesting.

Cost of living is higher with recent reports of flour, bread, milk having gone up. It is true that the recent national average wage has gone over $6,000 but in these 38 counties, as an example, conditions are getting worse rather than better. It should be noted that in each of these counties more than 25 percent of the families had a total cash income of less than $3,000. In 19 counties between 26 percent and 40 percent of the total families had less than $3,000 and in the remaining 19 counties the percentage was from 50 percent to 74 percent, or the overall average for the entire area shows 37 percent of the families with a cash income of less than $3,000 during 1960. This compares with 29 percent for the entire State and 21 percent for the United States. Obviously this shows, because of lack of economic opportunity at home and unemployment, a people are forced to migrate for sheer survival, working for what they can. How can you and I expect them to stay in an area where there is no hope?

Adding to the economic plight, I would like to add that the farmworkers are unable to work as many days a year as other workers. National data for 1964 indicates that the farmworkers who worked for wages for more than 25 days on farms during the year averaged less than 150 days of employment and secured a total annual income of only $1,213.

Eliminating the farmworkers who did not have to change their residence to seek work, we find that migrants in 1964 averaged only $935 a year, well below the $3,000 national poverty line. In the area known as the Southern Region by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, most Texas farmworkers worked only 115 days and earned an average of only $656.

With these wages one does not have to wonder about the great dilemma which faces the migrant—should he stay under these conditions or flee into the metropolitan area?

A lesson in recent history should be learned and remembered by each of us concerned with rural poverty. In the South, some 3 million people have left the land since 1940. Most of these forced off southern farms have been Negro sharecroppers and tenant farmers who have migrated to northern and western ghetto communities. (At one point they were flocking to the Watts area in Los Angeles at the rate of 1,000 a month.) Ironic that these have been the scenes of social turmoil in recent history.

The migrant OEO office reports that migrant farmworkers and their families total 7½ million. At our recent Mexican-American preplanning sessions for the White House Conference, Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz told us that within 10 years it is hoped that the migrant stream will be a thing of the past. This may be the case as far as work for the migrant is concerned, but from the above data the picture is otherwise. More people will join this great hungry army, but this time there will be no work. You and I know that for all the MDTA programs of the Labor Department, this does not even begin to approach what is necessary to even say we are the least bit concerned.

The points as outlined by Mr. Tom Karter of the migrant OEO office at the Mexican-American preplanning sessions of the White House Conference should be studied.

Gentlemen, if what the Secretary tells us is true, and I have every reason to believe and support him, then I predict a catastrophe caused by a growing army of those looking for work, traveling as they do now into 48 of the 50 States, cursing those who say there is equal opportunity, there is hope in America. My only point in this dismal picture is that in your new course you will need a lot of action.

Government Employment in Work Relating to the Rural Area and the Spanish Speaking

One would think that the picture as to employment in the U.S. Government would offer a semblance of hope, yet even in those services which immediately affect the rural area and more directly the Spanish speaking, surprises are forthcoming.

In the report "Minority Groups in Federal Employment," June 1961, the U.S. Department of Agriculture has this description:

	Total Number	Spanish Speaking	
		Number	Percent
Total	92,104	1,477	1.6
Classification Act or similar:			
Total	78,661	794	1.0
Grades GS 1–4	24,654	487	2.0
Grades GS 5–11	44,180	286	.6
Grades GS 12–18	9,827	11	.1
Wage board:			
Total	11,477	682	5.9
Up to $4,499	7,451	599	8.0
$4,500 to $7,999	3,955	83	2.1
$8,000 and over	71	0	* .0

---

* I am sure the situation has improved. This is given to show the point of lack of position in those fields that deal directly with the Spanish speaking. Perhaps MDTA can work on this.

The often-repeated complaints of many who attended the preplanning sessions can be summed up in the words of Mr. Pinon of San Jose, Calif.: "We do not have those who are knowledgeable from our point of view of the problems that are inherent to this large segment of the community, and until such time as we do have representations of knowledgeable people who are bilingual and bicultural, you will never get a true picture of what the problem is."

Studying the conference remarks from representatives from the five Southwestern States, especially applicable to the problems of the frontier or border, some of the areas that were questioned as to lack of employment representation, notwithstanding the direct contact with the Spanish speaking (as evidenced in the bracero program) and a need for bilingualism were: The employment service, the social security offices, State welfare offices, immigration, border patrol, migrant programs, the U.S. Department of Labor programs, and highway departments (especially where Federal funds are used).

Case after case, as reported in the preplanning conference, in those areas of employment that have to do with services to the people, more especially to the rural areas, a complete breakdown too frequently takes place because of lack of ability to communicate one's responsibility of service. Over and beyond this, a lack of confidence is engendered on the part of those who are served. Lack of identity even adds to the situation. As a result, he who serves and he who is served are in an impasse with an obvious failure for whatever program or service is being promoted.

In this area of employment it must be pointed out that the migrant OEO of Washington must be commended in their employment of Mexican Americans for policy-making levels in migrant programs. This is indicated by the migrant State coordinator of the State of Arizona.

Thus far I have touched only on education and employment, both of which are the keys of the Mexican American, especially in the rural area of the Southwest.

For the matter of record it is essential in the unfolding of this story that you have a few other facts relating to the Spanish speaking in these areas.

Housing

From one of the most progressive States we have this report by the Department of Industrial Relations:

> The housing needs of California's agricultural workers have been the subject of continued State concern and limited State power for nearly 50 years—long enough to require radical changes in both policy and concept if we are to develop at this late date a workable program to alleviate the critical housing deficiencies to be discussed in this report.
>
> No other occupational group has been the *recipient of more study and less effective action*, nor had its fortunes more entangled in public policy to less advantage. Fewer than 20 percent of the farmworkers covered in our study lived in dwellings which could be considered adequate by present standards of health, safety, and comfort. Sixty-three percent of the dwelling units occupied by general fieldworkers were dilapidated or deteriorated. For 33 percent of the dwelling units occupied by general fieldworkers, the only toilet facilities were pit privies. Thirty percent of the dwellings had no bathing facilities, and twenty-five percent lacked even so basic a necessity as a kitchen sink with running water.
>
> These conditions offer little evidence of improvement in the relative economic and social position of the agricultural worker in California. He remains, as he has since the State's early transition to intensive labor in farming, among the most poorly paid, poorly fed, and poorly housed of California's citizens.

This is the indictment of America, our country, for a condition upon which every man, woman, and child in this country must share blame since we all depend upon our most important commodity, food, and too often he who reaps it does not have enough.

It goes without saying that poor housing breeds poor health, poor health begets disease, and it is this condition that we permit to surround the tables of our nation, a nation so concerned with cleanliness and order, but not worried about the health of those providing the wherewith by which we safeguard our own health. What a picture!

Justice

You are well aware of the relationship of poor housing and delinquency. Yet we turn to the realm of justice as is found in our rural areas and up and down the rural Southwest you seldom find the Mexican American on the jury list, as is indicated in the enclosed list of Atascosa County, Tex. This was not 5 or 10 years ago. This was last March and last July, 1966. In March, of 48 names, one Spanish name appears and in July we find great progress since we advanced to two, on list, No. 3 of petit jurors drawn by the jury commissioners for the District Court of Atascosa County, Tex., for the week beginning the 11th day of July 1966.

It is common knowledge that our grand juries are even worse. The law of the land provides that one be judged by his peers, yet how many of our people have been and are today denied this? How many cases are on record where interpreters were refused in court? By the way, it would interest you to know that in the aforementioned county the Spanish-speaking population in 1960 was 45 percent of the total.

A few other areas that can be briefly touched upon are the draft, or the armed services. Here we find a people who, as an ethnic group, have manifested a love for country and for the land they know so well, unlike any other group. This ethnic group has had the most Congressional Medals of Honor. It has no recorded turncoat in any war. On the other hand, looking at the entrance exams data of the rural areas, many of our young, anxious to defend our country, find that this same country has not provided sufficient educational equipment in order to allow them to be able to do their share. Who is to blame? What can be done? How long can this go on? Gentlemen, frustration that is caused by ignorance can be tolerated, but frustration caused by design brings despair.

Rural Health Care

I would recommend that you look into the number of people living on the frontier who, because of low wages, seek medical attention across the border. How available is medical attention to our rural people? Please research the tremendous distances to hospitals and doctors. You will also find, as I have, that the local doctors in some cases are the sheriff or the county judge. One could jest, but I am sure it is imperative that in this situation one must do more than take care of his health, he must also look out for himself.

These are but a few facts which I wish to bring to your attention as you set your course in the bold attempt to improve the dismal picture that is presented here. It will be a difficult task, but not as difficult as it is for several of our youth who expressed themselves to me recently, "There is so much dislike and disrespect, it is hard to prove one's worth to the majority," or, "There is such a sense of discrimination and hatred." You, gentlemen, are the new hope of our day. May I repeat here recommendations that have already been made by Senator Harrison Williams. I endorse and approve them wholeheartedly:

1. There is, therefore, urgent need for increasing Federal appropriations if we are to provide even minimal medical attention for this segment of our population. It is also essential for each local community to expand its health services and to adapt them to the migrant situation if the migrant's basic rights to health services are to be served.

2. While the War on Poverty has made an admirable start in its efforts to improve the life of the migrant, it is obvious that the amount of funds and trained personnel necessary to alleviate the problems presented are still lacking. During the next 2 years funds for migrant worker projects under the War on Poverty should be

at least doubled so that these programs of demonstrated value may be brought to all migrant farm families. Again it must be noted that in the President's budget this year's appropriations are being cut, notwithstanding the fact that we hear reports that within a few years the migrant stream, if not curtailed altogether, at least will be almost nonexistent. My, what will the picture be like for the members of the families of almost 2 million workers?

3. Continued efforts must be made to improve the administration of the act in order to assure the registration of farm labor contractors where they are subject to its provisions. Protection of farmworkers from exploitation and abuse by irresponsible crew leaders including misrepresentation of crop conditions and anticipated earnings, overcharging for groceries or meals, illegal sale of liquor, gambling, dope, and other illegal activities.

4. The present exemption from the Fair Labor Standards Act of agricultural child labor outside of school hours should be narrowed so as to prevent employment of children in work which is hazardous or detrimental to their health and well-being.

5. The benefits of collective bargaining rights and procedures of the National Labor Relations Act should be extended to our citizens employed in agriculture.

6. Federal aid should be made applicable to the numerous and diverse problems of financing migratory farmworker housing.

7. Unemployment insurance laws or similar income security measures should be made available to migratory farmworkers.

8. Compulsory workmen's compensation laws should be extended so as to provide coverage for all agricultural workers.

9. Coverage of the farmworker under the old age, survivors, and disability insurance provisions of the Social Security Act.

10. Public welfare assistance should be made available to the migratory farm family on the basis of need without regard to the question of residence.

11. The problem of voting eligibility of migrants should receive careful study.

12. Inclusion of more workers under the Federal minimum wage for farmworkers.

Further Recommendations

1. Continued redevelopment of the border (frontier): If we can spend $300 million in Brazil we can concentrate just a bit on both sides of our frontier. This would not only take care of the rural employment, but also ease the controversial green card situation which we ask you to study. I do commend the administration for its two latest developments, the establishment of an international commission of Mexico and the United States for redevelopment of the frontier, and the establishment of the "Four Corners Region of Utah, New Mexico, Colorado, and Arizona for economic regional development." (Dec. 19, 1966)

2. Greater emphasis by the Administration on rural farmworker and nonfarmworker education, especially recommending assistance in furthering the concept of bilingualism, or the approach of teaching children English in Spanish when this is their first language. May I extend an invitation to San Antonio, Tex., for our statewide conference on bilingualism April 13, 14, 15, 1967.

3. Greater assistance in scholarship programs and loans for

rural youth of Mexican descent. (As indicated above, it is easier for a student from India and Africa to get assistance to our colleges, notwithstanding their low grade point level.)

4. Especially in Government jobs and Government contracts, assist in the more meaningful application of equal opportunity for rural farmworkers and nonfarmworkers. Those areas should be noted where services are in direct contact with the Spanish speaking such as has been mentioned earlier.

5. Assist in obtaining minimum wage for nonfarm rural workers.

6. Make a study and rectify the number of rural youth of Mexican descent who have not been accepted into the military.

7. Help make justice mean equality for all under the law. Assist in representation on juries.

8. You will find the need for a center of statistical research and data on the Spanish speaking. Data up to this point is varied from source to source.

9. Assist in a clearer picture of what really lies ahead.

Gentlemen, you have a big task ahead of you. You have my prayers and my offer of full cooperation. Give my people, our fellow Americans, just a chance, a little hope, so that as they have shown themselves in the heat of the sun, on our battlefields, they together with each of us may join the ranks of this fight on poverty. May we each, together hand in hand, do our part to lift the infamous badge of shame so that as a pluralistic society that we are, each with his own rich heritage, may make his contribution toward the development of our Nation as a leader second to none.

This concludes my written statement, gentlemen.

There is just one additional thing, if I did not mention it before, I have a chart here which is also submitted for your consideration, and this chart shows the State laws covering farmworkers, shown by State; also the workmen's compensation in that State; the State minimum wage; the social insurance—unemployment and disability insurance—and whether or not there are requirements in law as to housing.

I am sorry if I have taken too much of your time, but these matters are of great importance to me, as they are to you, and I trust my report will be of some assistance to you in your deliberations and in making your recommendations.

Thank you very much.

Mr. **Henderson**: Thank you very much, Reverend Casso. Particularly, we are very happy to receive these some 20-odd recommendations that you have given us.

Now, we have just a few minutes for questions. We have two more witnesses.

At this time, I will ask the Commissioners on the right if they have any questions. (No response.)

All right, those on the left.

Mr. **Fischer**: Reverend Casso, is the failure of most of the young men of Mexican descent to be accepted for the armed services rooted in the problem of literacy or health?

Mr. **Casso**: I think if you would reflect on the two main points I have stated, education and employment, education and employment which comes about as a result of the health condition and

STATE LAWS COVERING FARMWORKERS

State	Workmen's compensation	State minimum wage	Social insurance (unemployment and disability insurance)	Housing
California	Compulsory.	$1.30/hr. for women and for all minors between 16 and 18.	Disability insurance for most farmworkers	Requirements in law.
New Mexico	Voluntary at discretion of employer.	None.	None.	Requirements by regulation.
Texas	None.	None.	None.	None.
Colorado	Voluntary at discretion of employer.	None.	None.	Requirements in law.
Arizona	Compulsory for some workers.	None.	None.	Requirements in law.
Michigan	Compulsory for most workers.	$1.25/hr. for some workers after Jan. 1, 1967.	None.	Requirements by regulation.
New York	Compulsory after April 1, 1967.	None.	None.	Requirements by regulation.
New Jersey	Compulsory.	$1.25/hr. until Dec. 15, 1967, $1.40/hr. thereafter.	None.	Requirements by regulation.

illiteracy condition of the Mexican Americans. So, it is all one piece.

Mr. GALLEGOS: I realize that time is of the essence, and we have not had a chance to go through your paper, and I am therefore not certain if there was any reference specifically to the role of churches and their concern for this problem.

What main emphasis do you feel needs to be worked on as far as the church is concerned? You addressed yourself I realize to the many problems, and I am wondering what the role of the church is?

Mr. CASSO: First of all, I stated categorically that the church and the leadership in the church, speaking of the clergy, they must be involved in the uplifting of the people in the Southwest.

The church is a leader of the people and must necessarily be involved in the uplifting of the people, and they must be involved in time of crisis, and I think we are in a time of crisis right now.

I myself would not be here in another week; I am transferring out of this area.

However, I think you can take the Protestants, the Catholics, and the Jews, all of the clergy in those religions are quite dedicated to the rural poverty, and as I have indicated, many of the programs that are initiated, particularly in the migrant field, have been done so by the church.

Mr. HENDERSON: Reverend Casso, I am going to pass the microphone to the Chairman of these hearings, and I think he wants to make a statement with regard to calling some other witnesses. But, I do think before I leave the room that I might just make a point.

Mr. Oscar Laurel is a district attorney and he has very ably handled these hearings and we have had a very tight schedule and I just want to say that all of the members of the Commission think he has done a tremendous job and we very much appreciate it.

I wanted to state that before I left the room.

Mr. CASSO: Well, I saw all of you yesterday working into the night and I know you have all worked very hard on this hearing and I personally wish to thank you for taking so much time to listen to us in giving you this information, sometimes repetitive information.

The CHAIRMAN: I would like to state for the benefit of those who do not know of Father Casso, I know of him very well. He lives in San Antonio, which is about 150 miles north of where I live at Laredo.

I know that Father Casso has exercised the energetic zeal which is very essential in leading and trying to solve the problems of the Mexican Americans, not only in Texas, but all over the country. We are indebted to him for the leadership that he has shown.

We also wish to give our thanks to the Bishops' Committee for the Spanish Speaking, which Father Casso has lead so effectively and so forcefully and so eloquently.

Father Casso, we are indebted to you and I speak as one of many who has the greatest admiration for the work that you have done.

Mr. CASSO: I might mention to you in case you are anxious to get in touch with me if I may be of any help to you, this week I am moving from the Bishops' Committee for the Spanish Speaking and I have been assigned to the new post called the Episcopal Bishop of Urban Industry.

As you well know, the urban area is the center of much controversy, and we have a lot of work to do there.

But, I guarantee you and I offer to you my hand in heartiest cooperation. If there is any way whatsoever that I can be of assistance to you, I want you always to feel that you will have my heartiest cooperation and good wishes.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Father Casso.

The Commission will now recognize Rev. William Welsh, of the Mohave County Area Development Council, and he is the executive director of that organization.

WILLIAM W. WELSH

Mr. WELSH: I am Reverend William W. Welsh, and I represent the Mohave County Area Development Council, Inc., 809 E. Beal, Room 226, Kingman, Ariz.

My statement is, in fact, a narrative report for CAP application regarding problems, history, projected goals of MCADC, Inc.

In addition to the impacted areas of poverty and rural poverty, scattered throughout the 13,000 square miles of Mohave County, there are many and varied problems facing the county at this time, not the least of which is a population explosion, which, of course, brings its own unique problems, such as unemployment, inadequate housing, lack of proper school facilities, and county and city government problems to serve an ever-increasing population.

Among the problems of the county as a whole are those of flood control, lack of water and sewage facilities, and many other problems related directly or indirectly to the poverty program, as well as to other Federal, State, and local agencies, which must be brought into operation, and which were specifically designed to be integrated into, and coordinated with the local community action agency.

Insofar as first things must always be done first in county or community planning and development, the Mohave County Area Development Council, Inc., has, in many instances, not only initiated the first steps to be taken, but has outlined procedures to be followed, which many times has proven to be the "spark plug" by which progress became feasible and possible.

In this connection, as early as July 1962, the development council was organized, and immediately started preparing an overall economic opportunity program, which was submitted and approved by Washington as of December 6, 1963. In March of 1965, the development council was incorporated, which thus enabled it to enter into contracts with the Federal, State and county Governments, and particularly to enter into a contract with OEO whereby the council became the community action agency for Mohave County, with the approval of the board of supervisors.

Because Mohave County was ready with a comprehensive planning ordinance with provisions for zoning, the State Bureau of Land Management office and the Department of the Interior selected Mohave County as one of the "pilot study areas" in the United States for the evaluation of Federal lands under the new Public Land Sales Act and the Land Laws Review Commission.

In addition, Mohave County was one of four counties in Arizona earlier designated by the former ARA as a redevelopment area and was selected by the Department of Agriculture as a "pilot county."

Under the Public Works and Economic Development Act, Mohave County was again designated, but was dedesignated June 30, 1966, along with Apache, Coconino and Navajo Counties. However, the Indian tribes within the counties have ultimately been redesignated. This fact qualifies Mohave County and Yuma County, together with their Indian tribes, to form an economic development district.

Having anticipated just such an eventuality, the development council has already prepared and submitted an overall economic development program (OEDP) for Mohave County, which was approved by the EDA Office in Washington, but action will be withheld until Yuma County, and the Indian tribes involved, have submitted and gained approval of their OEDP's. In the meantime, it is certain that the development council will have prepared an OEDP for the proposed Colorado River and Western Arizona Economic Development District.

Approval of the proposed district will, in effect, give Mohave County, and communities within the county, the "priority" needed to take advantage of federally funded programs which heretofore have been denied.

For instance, Mohave County made application last year for 701 project funds through HUD for the development of mapping and planning in the Kingman suburban area, Colorado City area, and the Mohave Valley-Bullhead City area. This has not yet been approved, but with the establishment of an economic development district, our priority rating will accelerate its approval in Washington.

On April 5, 1966, the county board of supervisors, acting on the recommendation of the development council, authorized the preparation of a comprehensive countywide plan for rural communities covering water and sewer requirements. As a result, these communities are now, or soon will be, in a position to request grants and loans from the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Farmers Home Administration, on planning and implementing, after they have determined their needs through their neighborhood councils working with the county board of supervisors and the planning and zoning commission. This would not be limited to water and sewer needs, but would also apply to road improvements, flood control, and other related projects of need.

With our previous priority rating under ARA, and EDA, the development council, through its industrial committee, was successful in securing a grant for a feasibility study at the airport. As a result of this study, General Cable Co., in its search for a new site, is now planning for early construction of a $10 million plant at the airport. The establishment of this major industry into the area will undoubtedly attract more industry.

Mohave County is already the fastest growing area in Arizona as shown by a recent study made by the State Employment Service. Since 1960, Mohave County has gained in population from 7,700 to well over 18,000. The projected growth by 1975 is expected to accelerate to 50,000 persons. In fact, "growing pains" are already with us, as well as problems connected with this accelerated growth.

As a development council and as a community action agency for the entire county, it is the firm belief of our directors that money spent *now* to correct problems before they arise, along with those already existing, during this accelerated growth period, will prevent very much costlier programs when this growth results in a hodgepodge such as that which now exists in the suburban east and west coast cities.

We feel certain that the officials of OEO are familiar with the many Federal grants, loans, and aids available through the many agencies and bureaus of the Government, which a rural and an underdeveloped area such as Mohave County could and would be able to develop and implement through a properly funded community action agency. We also feel that it must be realized and understood that the monumental task involved requires a well-staffed CAP, in order to correlate and coordinate all of the available programs and resources—local, State, and Federal—for both the urban and rural areas of a county the size of the States of Massachusetts and Connecticut combined.

Not only is Mohave County the third largest county in the continental United States, but the communities are widely separated. For instance, the Strip Area which lies north of the Colorado River, is approximately 325 miles from Kingman. The shortest route to the Strip Area necessitates traveling through two States, Nevada and Utah, and reentering Arizona twice. This is ordinarily a 3-day trip.

Mohave County has some 1,000 miles of shoreline along the Colorado River and three manmade lakes located along the river. Add to this, that another dam is under construction in the southernmost part of the county, on the Bill Williams River some 200 miles from Kingman, and one would begin to get some idea of the magnitude of our county.

It has been clearly established by the grassroots effort here that education and training to take advantage of employment opportunities is basic, not only to the alleviation of poverty and substandard living conditions, but to its prevention in the Kingman-suburban area and rural communities. This applies particularly to the Indians, both on and off the reservation, and to our Mexican-American population.

Apathy and frustration on the part of the Indians, as revealed by our grassroots workers, is evidenced by the high suicide rate among the Hualapais, which is among the highest in the nation. Almost every Indian family qualifies for the poverty program. Their housing here in Kingman is deplorable—no inside toilet facilities, and only a few houses are equipped with even cold water. On the Reservation, conditions are certainly no better. Over 900 Hualapais live in fewer than 100 shacks, ranging in size from about 216 square feet to approximately 900 square feet.

On the other hand, the Mexican-American and rural Anglo population are motivated by a fierce pioneer pride. Not only do they not possess the education and training to better their environment and living conditions, but resent being classified as poverty people. Therefore, the community action role here is a very touchy one, which can only be approached with tact, understanding, and much patience. A partial breakthrough has been accomplished, first, by our Headstart and NYC programs, and then by Operation Grassroots. There still remians much to be done.

Mr. Chairman, I have submitted two documents, both of about 160 pages, containing statistics, and those I have been assured will be forwarded as exhibits.

I also have a letter from the Bureau of Land Management picking out Mohave County as a pilot county.

I also have a letter from the Department of Agriculture Extension University of Arizona, and they point out why they picked out Mohave County as the pilot county.

So, with those few remarks, I will not take any more of your time.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Reverend Welsh.

I will confirm the fact that you have given us two different bound volumes on the work that you have done. They will be recorded as part of the exhibits which have been received during the hearings.

We apologize to you for taking so long in recognizing you.

Mr. WELSH: That is all right, I do want to thank you.

Now, I have a guest who I would like to introduce, and she would like to make a few remarks.

The CHAIRMAN: All right, would you like to introduce your guest?

Mr. WELSH: Yes, this is Mrs. Nanny Nish. She represents the off-reservation Indians in Kingman, Ariz.

I would like to give you just a short sketch of about 3 minutes on Mohave County.

Mohave County is the third largest county in the United States. It is the second largest in Arizona, and it is the fastest growing.

It represents an opportunity to put into effect principles and policies that can avoid the problems that you have in the rest of the nation where they have been remiss in making plans.

We started the development council in 1962, and by 1963 we had realized that the basic problems in that area was a matter of water and industry, development of industry.

We took advantage of the ARA and the EDA and, as a result, from the United States Geological Survey, we found that there was water right there in Kingman at the airport, whereas the Army had gone 25 miles up the road to bring in water in 1942.

As a result of the surveys I have handed you, Mr. Chairman, we have recently had the good fortune of inducing General Cable, the largest fabrication people in the country, to come into our area with a $10 million plant, one of the 40 they have throughout the country.

That was done by planning.

We are also one of the few counties in Arizona that have a planning and zoning commission.

Unless you have a plan, almost all of the agencies of Government will say, unless you have a plan we cannot do anything for you. But we do have a plan.

Now, our problem is that we are in the northwest section. There are 13,000 square miles and 8 million acres, and it is not out of the way, but perhaps it is because of the vast highways that everybody races to get through it. We cannot get anybody from the regional office or from the State offices to come and see our county. So, we have gone on our own and, as a result, we have accomplished quite a bit.

We have had Headstart and we have had Youth Corps, and we have had Medicare; and, for a county as large as ours, we came out with 95 percent Medicare, a 95 percent Medicare record.

We got started on this as a result of our Indian situation there, and I just want to read one short thing here:

> Apathy and frustration on the part of the Indians, as revealed to our grassroots workers, is to be evidenced by the high suicide rate of the Hualapais which is among the highest in the Nation.

Now, needless to say, we were shocked when the young Indian that was working for us went out and got drunk and committed suicide. So, we got at the bottom of it and found out why. He had been an assistant plumber. His boss brought in his own son-in-law and put him in the job and the Indian was put out of a job. He immediately got frustrated and went over and got drunk and was thrown into jail, and with the usual Indian way of thinking—they do not blame somebody else, they blame themselves—and that is why he committed suicide. That is why we have the high suicide rate with the Indians.

Now, we started out on this off-reservation Indian—we started on those Indians, because we have about 150 there in Kingman. I have been working at it for 2 years. We finally came to the conclusion, after trying to do business with the Government, with all the redtape and everything, we finally came to the conclusion, that we were going to have to organize the off-reservation Indians as a nonprofit operation that could make contact directly with the Government and the various agencies.

I found that there were 10,000 off-reservation Indians in Maricopa County that were not organized. They cannot speak as do the reservation Indians.

So, with those few remarks, I now want to introduce Nanny Nish to tell you her story. I cannot give you the picture of the conditions that they live in, but Nanny is a very proud Indian and she is one of the off-reservation Indians of Kingman, Ariz.

STATEMENT OF NANNY NISH

Mrs. NISH: Yes, I am an off-reservation Indian and I have been all my life. I have raised my children through junior high school, and I am a widow.

Through junior high and by the time they get into their freshman year, I have four boys at that time, they were young.

I went to the BIA (Bureau of Indian Affairs) official to see if I could get some funds to pay for their schoolbooks because I was still a member of the Hopi Tribe and all of my children are enrolled there.

However, they are half Pima Indians, a distant relative to our nation, and when I went to the BIA, I was refused because I lived off of the reservation.

So therefore I knew we had to pay for our schoolbooks. So, I worked then, I worked as a maid and a laundress in a motel. Finally, my daughter graduated from high school, from Mohave County High School, and she had worked her way through school, by working on Saturdays and Sundays, and late on Sunday nights, and she paid her way through high school.

All right, I had the other four boys—I mean three boys—and they did the same thing. They worked through their high school years by going out and working for cafes washing dishes. That is the way they paid for their school books.

I am so proud to say that I have three that graduated from high school. Now, when they graduated, they came to me and said, "What are we going to do?"

I said, "There isn't anything to do, but we will try again."

So, I went back to the BIA again and I was still refused any assistance for education and they cannot go on to college. However, they are good boys. They have no police records. They are what I call gentlemen; and my daughter is 27 years old. She had one year of business school and she knew I couldn't do it alone. So, she came back and she helped me put these boys through high school.

Now, the oldest boy is in the National Guard for 3 years. The other boy enlisted in the Marines, and he will be leaving soon. The other boy will be going into the Army soon; and they all passed their physicals okay.

Now, the only solution that we have now is that they are going to have to go through the Army in order to get their training. Sometimes it often makes me wonder whether I am better off on or off the reservation.

But, these are the reasons we had to leave the reservation, because there were no jobs on the reservation. There was not a good school there for our children to go to school, so I made up my mind that I wanted my children to at least get high school diplomas. So, that is how I came off of the reservation.

Not only that, we come from a slum area, which I am ashamed to say, but it is the happiest home I have. I don't care what it might look like to others, but we are happy. No matter how much trouble I have had—I have been a widow three times—and I have brought my children up the best I know how. Some day, they are going to serve their country.

Now, on this BIA, I don't know where all the funds have gone. They are not using them to educate the Indians, to better ourselves, I know we are not getting that money.

So, I would like to know and I would like for you to take these matters up in Washington; that is, whatever the BIA is putting out, it is not reaching the Indians. What we really want is just so we can get our children educated or trained in order that they can make a living for themselves and for the future of the American common Indians.

On housing, we live in a slum area on the sand. Some day, if the flood comes, we will be going down the drain.

We need the low cost housing where we can pay and so that we can say we are going to be out of the slums for a little while anyway.

Thank you.

The **CHAIRMAN**: Thank you very much, Mrs. Nish.

Mr. **WELSH**: May I just supplement her statement?

The **CHAIRMAN**: Go right ahead, sir.

Mr. **WELSH**: They actually do live in a slum, the only one we have there, and if a flash flood comes through, there is no question but what they will be wiped out.

Until we got busy there, they did not even have any electricity in their house. They have one ¾-inch water pipe which comes from the city out there.

They built themselves a little church. They did this with self-help, and we got them a little loan at the bank and through the loan from the bank, they put up some electrical work. Then, we went to the Farmers Home Administration.

Let me say this, whatever everybody else has told you, here in northern Arizona, Farmers Home Administration has done their best to help us, but they get caught.

The Department of Agriculture here, through the extension bureau here in Tucson, has been marvelous to us. But the Farmers Home Administration has sent two men up there that I knew. They said, "Well, this is right up our alley. We just got through doing this for the Papagos in San Carlos, and they are building little houses."

Then, Laura Hanetone spoke up and said, "We are glad you are going to do something for us, because the city never did a thing."

I said, "My God, Laura, are you in the city?"

She said, "Yes, didn't you know that?"

But then, the Farmers Home Administration had to pull out, because they could only work in the county. So we had to wait for a year or so to get some new legislation on urban renewal, and we still haven't been able to solve the problem.

Every once in a while, we try our best and we run into a situation of that kind.

I think Nanny will confirm that we have tried our best, but we finally came to the conclusion that with all the interest there is, we had to organize the off-reservation Indian people into a nonprofit organization so that they in turn could speak for themselves and make new contacts with the Government and speak on their own behalf.

I think there is one question I would like to ask Nanny to speak to, if I may, and that is that so many people say, "Why don't they go back to the reservation?" So, Nanny, will you answer that for us?

Mrs. NISH: Well, there are no jobs and there is no good schooling there. I have been off the reservation all my life and I have become so independent, and I want my children to be independent, to be on their own.

I don't want them to be getting babied by somebody. That is the way I feel.

Not only that, that used to be my ancestors' country, and I was born and raised over in Chloride; so therefore I didn't like it on the reservation.

There is another thing I would like to present to you that I forgot.

That is about our medical care. We are often denied by the Public Health as to our medical care because we are off the reservation. Then when the manager of the county hospital at Kingman, he says that we are welcome, and he doesn't mean that. So, I had an experience 3 or 4 years ago where I had to be treated, and just 2 months ago, I had a bill for $500 and I was surprised. But, that doctor, those people will not get to see me any more, they will cut my leg off.

It is so funny, you know, the Government says, "We are going to educate the Indian," and when we are educated, they don't want us to get the best of people.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, are there any questions?

Mr. WELSH: May I make one more remark?

The CHAIRMAN: We are going to have to leave pretty quickly, Reverend Welsh.

Mr. WELSH: Well, I want to say that Nanny's three sons were the stars on the football team and many of them for all of Arizona.

The other thing I want to say is that I have not heard, and I have been listening for a day and a half, I have not heard anyone say anything about the elderly people before. We have said nothing about the poverty that comes to the people that have to walk 20 miles and have no contact by telephone.

We have one section up on the strip where they did not even have a telephone for 30 years until we showed them how to get it.

Nobody has seemed to have been thinking about how to avoid the problems that we have in the big cities. We have heard the statistics about the rural areas moving to big cities. We are being built up and we want to do something about it, and we do not want to have the smog and all the problems you have in big cities, so we want to make some plans before it happens.

So we are trying to see if we cannot do some thinking and planning beforehand.

Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Reverend Welsh and Mrs. Nish. It is a pleasure for us to hear from you.

We will take time just for one or two quick questions.

Mr. GALLEGOS: You said that there was difficulty and that some are refused admission to county hospitals and medical service, and it is because you are an off-the-reservation Indian?

Mrs. NISH: Yes.

Mr. GALLEGOS: What is the stated policies of the Bureau of Indian Affairs with respect to medical services for off-reservation Indians?

Mr. WELSH: I believe that Dr. Roessel could answer that better than I can.

Mr. ROESSEL: The Bureau of Indian Affairs provides services only for Indians living on the reservation.

The CHAIRMAN: Dr. Davis?

Mr. LAWRENCE DAVIS: In connection with the problem of getting your sons in college if they could qualify academically, they may be eligible for national defense education loans and grants.

Mr. ROESSEL: Well, they might be; but it is difficult in terms of having enough money to go around to all of the places necessary.

But they are eligible for it; there is no doubt about that.

Mr. LAWRENCE DAVIS: It would seem worthwhile to me to try to put a package together. And I was just wondering if that had been considered.

Mr. WELSH: We have not overlooked a bet. You can be assured that we have tried everything.

The CHAIRMAN: All right, thank you very much, both of you, for appearing here today.

Now, we will hear from Mrs. Elizabeth Clark, volunteer worker in American Indian Affairs Association.

You may proceed, Mrs. Clark.

STATEMENT OF ELIZABETH CLARK

Mrs. CLARK: Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, my name is Elizabeth Clark from Billings, Mont. For the past 6 years I have served as a volunteer worker of the Association on American Indian Affairs, working with the Northern Cheyenne Indians of Montana. The association is a private, nonprofit membership corporation devoted to safeguarding the rights and promoting the welfare of American Indians. Beginning in 1960, the association agreed to cooperate with the Northern Cheyenne Tribal Council and its chairman, Mr. John Woodenlegs, to try to stimulate a broad program of community development on their reservation.

The Northern Cheyenne Indians certainly compose some of the rural poor living in Montana. Their problems of poverty are much the same as other poor people: Inadequate education, lack of training for jobs, poor housing and sanitation, lack of job opportunities, a general hopelessness that helps keep them immobilized even to do what they could to help themselves. In addition, there are the added factors of a language barrier and of having a different cultural heritage which does not necessarily embrace many of the same values as the dominant culture.

Indian people have long suffered from the vacillation of Federal policy concerning them. A passive and sometimes active resistance to Government supervision in the form of the Bureau of Indian Affairs has often prevented the full development of programs which could have been helpful in improving the Indians' standard of living. The BIA is in the difficult position of being some kind of a regulatory force in the Indian's life, while trying at the same time to stimulate him, motivate him and gain his confidence and trust. In times past, the attitude of the BIA did not often welcome interest or assistance from outside sources. Hence it was not difficult for a stalemate to develop and little or no progress to be accomplished.

With the passing of new Federal legislation starting in 1960, many important avenues of opportunity began to be available to Indians. The Northern Cheyennes responded readily to the Area Redevelopment bill. In the preparation of the required overall economic development plan, the council began to become actively concerned with the resources of their area, their economic and social problems, their possible solutions. In subsequent years they utilized this bill to obtain (1) a manpower labor study later used by a company which located on the reservation, (2) a training course for craft workers whose products would later help supply a retail Indian craft outlet on the reservation, (3) a forest product feasibility study, (4) two grants of Accelerated Public Works money—used to employ men thinning forest, fencing rangeland, creating parks and public camping areas. The Accelerated Works money proved something—that given job opportunities locally, the Indians worked and worked well. Welfare and relief rolls went down, men were no longer idly loafing on the streets, children began to look better fed and clothed. A whole new atmosphere of hope and purpose came into the communities. While Public Works money is not a long-range answer for employment, it served as a needed stimulus to these people at a time they really needed it.

The Area Redevelopment bill, now superseded by the Economic Development Act, offers types of assistance to depressed areas which are very vital and often not obtainable elsewhere.

The Manpower Training Act is another opportunity for unskilled persons to obtain the training they so desperately need to become employable. The Cheyennes have not utilized this as much as might be hoped, but it is a valuable source of training which can often be done in the local community, therefore making it possible to recruit more persons than would be possible if the individuals had to go away for training.

The passage of the Economic Opportunity Act opened another range of opportunities for Indians. One of the best things OEO did was to insist these programs be planned at the local level, that the poor themselves be involved in that planning and subsequent implementation of programs. By early 1965, the Northern Cheyennes had had enough foundation in the basic process of community development, that they knew how to work together and utilize technical help to design OEO programs they wanted. They needed technical assistance in the paperwork, but the council was closely involved in the evolution of plans and they took these to their people in district meetings to see if the people wanted these programs. This laid the foundation for successful implementation of these plans when the time came that the programs could begin.

The Cheyennes are in their second year of OEO programs. They include Headstart in five centers serving the entire reservation, remedial reading for some 300 students in all schools, a community health program involving 10 trained Cheyennes who reach all resident families in health education work, a community worker who spends full time encouraging the people to participate and cooperate with these programs. Adult education classes are included—these may deal with how to "stretch" your dollar, how to budget your income, meal planning, and so forth—useful information for those to whom every penny counts. High school students have participated in two Upward Bound programs at Eastern Montana College in Billings to help stimulate them to go to college.

There is also a Neighborhood Youth Corps program which is providing valuable training to young people in how to be a good, dependable worker.

These OEO programs are all aimed at education—not just for children, but gradually including the adult population as well. One strong point is having Cheyenne aids and workers employed in the programs. They form a core of people whose training and added knowledge can in turn be shared with their families and friends. This is an informal, but significant form of adult education. We have to reach into the homes and lives of these people to help them become willing to help themselves. The key to their really taking advantage of the opportunities available is their desire to do it—the determination and courage to make the effort, a willingness to learn. Some modest success or achievement builds confidence, and this leads to the next step. A program may have to start with a handful of people because you may only be able to get a few to participate, but it can grow and spread to reach more and more as others see it is working and helping.

In addition to OEO programs and the stimulus they have brought, the policy of the Bureau of Indian Affairs has taken on new and larger dimensions. The BIA today works hand in hand with all agencies, it cooperates with nongovernment organizations, it works diligently for industrial development, improved education, vocational training. It welcomes OEO and its accomplishments. Marshalling forces can only spell faster progress. Interagency quarreling only postpones constructive action—the poor grow poorer while their "saviors" argue.

These are some observations I believe have some validity:

1. The poor must definitely help design programs intended for their benefit, be involved from the start.

2. Programs which are aimed at education, creating employment opportunities, on-the-job training provide the most lasting benefits.

3. While providing for adequate fiscal accounting, the local persons in charge of OEO programs should be given as much freedom as possible to get the job done. A burdensome overstructure of required meetings, continual surveys, special reports, and so forth, often prevent the local supervisor from having time to perform the job for which he was hired. He should be working with the local people to strengthen, upgrade, and expand programs, not be running all over the country to endless meetings.

4. The local community should retain the right to develop programs it feels are needed to solve its problems, not have programs superimposed from higher up.

5. Worthwhile programs which are showing progress to overcome poverty should be financed long enough to be able to accomplish results. Nothing is more devastating to those who make the effort to help themselves than to have the program summarily cut off. Morale crumbles and people become even more apathetic to any future effort to help themselves.

6. To guarantee a minimum annual income as a way to overcome poverty would kill the incentive of many persons to try to work at all. The same money proposed for this, if used for education, training stimulating employment opportunities, low rent housing, would be getting to the causes of poverty.

I believe the Northern Cheyennes offer a good example of people who have made a start to overcome poverty. They are utilizing all the resources available to them in the form of technical assistance, government loans and grants as well as using nongovernment sources of help and encouragement. Those of us closely involved in this effort strongly urge a continuation of the Economic Opportunity Act, the Elementary and Secondary School Act, the Manpower Training Act, the Economic Development Act, the National Housing Act. Indians should be included in any future legislation offering benefits in education, housing, economic development.

Give us time to use all these programs to overcome decades of chronic unemployment, poor education, poor housing. It takes years of effort to change and enlarge peoples' concepts so that they can even take advantage fully of the opportunities available to them. Without this continuing effort trying to reach all age levels, we will watch a repetition of one generation of welfare spawning another generation to succeed it. Welfare also costs money—it offers no solution, no hope, and demoralizes people in the end. Money spent to rehabilitate peoples' lives and help rejuvenate their communities is money spent to win the War on Poverty. Surely the richest country on earth cannot turn its back on those in need living right here among us.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions?

Mr. GIBSON: I just wanted, for the sake of clarification, to ask you to tell me whether—you spoke about guaranteed income approach—whether the mothers of children who are young and the mothers who are in the home and the elderly, I wonder whether or not you think they should be given an adequate kind of stipend, a guaranteed livable income.

Mrs. CLARK: Well, I said that I felt this was not the answer for some people, that it would conceivably cut off what incentive they have to work.

The reason I said that is that the Indian people, going back historically— Perhaps not intentionally, but what has been done for them has caused them to look to the Government as almost a way of life. We have destroyed their self-sufficiency to the point where many of them do not even know what it means to be self-sufficient.

Mr. GIBSON: Do you think this was done by giving them an adequate income?

Mrs. CLARK: No, I don't think that.

Mr. GIBSON: Well, do you think giving them an adequate income might be called a paternalistic program?

Mrs. CLARK: No, but the way I feel is that if they are given a guaranteed adequate income, many of them would not make an effort to try and help themselves; and I feel that people in the long run want to help themselves and make that effort if they are going to feel good about themselves and feel that they have dignity and the things that make people take an interest in leadership.

The CHAIRMAN: Where do you live, Mrs. Clark?

Mrs. CLARK: I live in Billings, which is about 100 miles from the reservation.

The CHAIRMAN: Do you do your work out of Billings, Mont.

Mrs. CLARK: Well, I go back and forth.

I think the real function that the Association has served in the Cheyenne people truthfully was a catalystic sort of thing. The Cheyennes and the Bureau seem to be stalemated.

Now, I am not here to pan the Bureau, I think their attitudes have changed. I feel that they are on the right track today. They have opened up, and they welcome other assistance, no matter what the source is; at least, that is our experience up there.

I think the BIA knows as well as anyone else that they cannot get this job done themselves; and they welcome OEO programs, and they welcome EDA and these other things that have become available; but, you know yourselves that these things were not available to the Bureau nor to the Indians in the past. There wasn't that kind of money, there was not that kind of assistance.

The CHAIRMAN: We certainly want to thank you for coming a long way to give us an insight as to what is being done in your part of the country that we have not heard from. We are very grateful to you for appearing here.

We also appreciate your patience in waiting so long to be heard.

Mrs. CLARK: I have learned a great deal from being here.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

Now, I would like to make this announcement.

This will conclude the taking of testimony at this meeting of the National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty.

Governor Breathitt, who is the Chairman of the Commission, was unable to be here, but he wanted to extend his best wishes to all members of the Commission and all of you who are present.

By the same token, as Chairman, or at least appointed Chairman for this particular meeting, I would like to thank each and every one of the witnesses who have appeared. I would like to thank all of you who have been in attendance, and the members of the press, radio, and television who have shown an unusual amount of interest.

We are all interested in the problems that affect some of the members of our society and we will carry, of course, all of the information that has been gathered and obtained here and we will assimilate it and give it under the charge of President Johnson; we will make a final report by next September.

Now, in connection with those of you who have shown an interest by attending these hearings, we want to tell you that we are very grateful to you, not only for the interest that you have shown, but the attentiveness you have given and the courtesy you have extended to each of us, each and every one of us who are members of the Commission.

To the staff and to everyone then, the Commission extends its gratitude and thanks.

To the people of Tucson, for this period of time we have been here, we are very grateful to them also.

I would like to tell the members of the Commission that we are going on a field trip; we have not finished our job; the bus will be in front of the hotel at 4 o'clock.

Now, just so I will not be misunderstood, I will say it in two languages.

(Announcement in Spanish.)

So, that gives added emphasis that we need to be there at 4 o'clock, and we must not be late.

Now, Mr. King wants to say something.

Mr. KING: Mr. Chairman, I think I can speak for the members of the Commission and I wish to express our thanks for the compassion and the understanding that you have handled this hearing with, not only to the Commission, but more importantly to the people who have been sitting at that table who have presented testimony here.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, I appreciate that.

This hearing is now closed.

(Whereupon, at 3:45 p.m. on Friday, January 27, 1967, the hearing was closed.)

MATERIAL SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY WILLARD ABRAHAM, ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

SOME THOUGHTS ON A FEW EDUCATIONAL DEFICIENCIES

(With Implications for Poverty, Dropouts, Slow Learners, and other Neglect Fields)

A highly qualified research person in the field of education came to the following conclusions:

> It takes 15 years for 3 percent of the schools to absorb a new idea.
>
> It takes 20 years for about 90 percent of the schools to accept and try it out.
>
> The rest may never get in on it at all.

In recent months this educational lag and lethargy, the resentment against innovation and the fear of new materials and techniques have been noted by keen observers of our schools. James Finn put it this way: ". . . organized education has never been even mildly progressive. It is one of the most conservative forces in America." Harold Benjamin said: "Free men cannot be taught properly by slaves. Courageous citizens cannot be well educated by scared hired men." John Gardner wrote that there is no shortage of new ideas: "The problem is to get a hearing for them," he concluded. "And that means *breaking through the crusty rigidity and stubborn complacency of the status quo*." (My italics.)

This important conference is attempting to do just that. And this paper will try to pinpoint a few of the tragic educational deficiencies we have struggled along with, needs that desperately require attention and change, areas for which some partial solutions have been available, and largely ignored.

Briefly, let's turn the spotlight on the following: Dropouts and slow learners (both plentifully present in our poverty groups); so-called bilingual children; a professional, high quality educational approach that is already available to help meet their educational needs; some concerns that money brings with it; the core of the situation—the teacher; and the need for better selection and preparation.

Let us recognize a few vital educational facts right at the start of these important two days:

A vast quantity of appropriate, well-prepared, validated educational materials are needed for the young populations we are discussing here.

They must be prepared specifically to meet the educational needs of different groups, different cultural backgrounds, different educational problems. Only a naive educator or publisher would lump together the various so-called bilingual groups, the various Indian groups, the various Negro groups, and others.

Many educational materials now in use are largely worthless for these populations. The facts to support this statement are apparent—dropout figures, antagonisms toward school, etc.

Dropouts

A boy from Guadalupe was recently graduated from high school and is now working, as his father did, in the cottonfields. What kind of example does he present to other young people whose teachers may be trying to encourage them to stay on in school?

Arizona State University conducted a "school leaver" study in 1957 which concluded that among the major reasons for dropping out was the low economic level of the family. The so-called "free" school turned out to be very costly when it was realized how much less income the family may have because an adolescent is in school instead of at work.

All dropouts are not slow learners. Many are bright but with reasons that seem sound to them for leaving school—marriage, adverse school experiences, adverse home circumstances, or others.

Slow Learners [1]

The American philosophy of education, based on educating every child to his capacity, cannot afford to make exceptions. The loss of potential manpower, the high dropout rate from our schools, the cost of unemployment, delinquency, and crime, the threat to sound family relationships and to individuals within families—all are direct or indirect consequences which can be traced, at least partly, to the fact that education has largely ignored the needs of an important segment of our society: the children often referred to as "slow learners."

Even in recent years a number of misconceptions and misunderstandings have persisted among parents, teachers, and others in their discussions of slow learners.

For example, many people still believe that an IQ is immobile, unchangeable, and set for all time. They do not recognize the influences of a rich or barren environment as contributing toward raising an intelligence capacity or lowering to a new intelligence floor. Another idea which may be comforting, but untrue, is that a child who is slow in one area is necessarily higher in others, perhaps even higher than the average person. Such compensation does not necessarily develop among human characteristics, for weakness in one area is not weighted by strength in another. Nor is there a balance established between verbal abilities (low) and nonverbal ones (high), or book-mindedness (low) and hand-mindedness (high). Hand activities may provide an area of reasonable success because of their concrete, meaningful nature rather than as a compensating factor for low academic abilities; they also may develop, of course, because of the longer time put into them.

Slow learners do not balance their low intellectual abilities with greater height and strength. This misconception sometimes stems from the fact that they are the tallest and huskiest in their classrooms, an easy matter to understand when one also notes that they may be the oldest because of nonpromotion.

A rather common misunderstanding is associated with slow learners as potential delinquents. It could be more accurately stated that all children are potential delinquents, with the possibility of becoming one directly related to a combination of factors such as environmental conditions (home and community) and frequency of being caught during or after the act. Because the environment of many slow learners is conducive to delinquent behavior, it may be more accurately assumed that in some cases the cause of one is at least partly responsible for the other.

Attributing slowness to intellectual limitations should not necessarily be a first step in stating a cause. Even more likely as a causation factor may be one or more of the conditions itemized below:

1. Socioeconomic limitations. James B. Conant and Patricia Sexton have presented findings to show the influence of such factors on children's performance in school. G. Orville Johnson has pointed to these limitations as resulting in "second-class citizens."

2. Cultural and language deprivations or differences. Frank Riessman in "The Culturally Deprived Child" makes a strong plea for the need to understand the culture of the underprivileged, including the positive aspects, such as child-rearing practices, humor, human relationships, and enjoyment of music.

3. Physical factors based on sight, hearing, immature development, malnutrition, or other health conditions. "Behavior and personality are related both to rate of development, or developmental status, and to physique and size." (Martin and Stendler)

4. Family problems or tensions, anxieties, quarrels, excessive mobility, lack of acceptance of child. Factors in parent-child relationships often raise questions that have no simple answers. Individual patterns of the child's "coping behavior" were the object of a study by Lois B. Murphy, whose findings add new dimensions to our knowledge of parent-child relationships. The factor of parent-child compatibility is an area which sometimes becomes the focal point when social service agencies in the community are involved in helping the "neglected child." Families often need services which would have helped to prevent or overcome problems leading to child neglect by providing parents

---

[1] This section based on ideas from the book entitled "The Slow Learner," published by the Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1964.

with help before the situation becomes so bad that court action may be involved.

5. School-related factors such as irregular attendance, inefficient teaching, distaste for school, poor study habits, repeated failure, and inadequate curriculum. Details of such factors are in the literature related to the migrant child, the dropout, and the research on learning and its implications for curriculum and administration.

6. Meager or barren educational resources in home and/or community. Conant points out that while the same methods are used in all the city elementary schools in a city, the average grade level of reading in the sixth grade, for example, may vary as much as two grades from one school to another. He points out the relations of the reading problem to the socioeconomic and cultural level of the home.

7. Incongruities among factors of ability, achievement, and aspiration as they relate to each other. The wide scatter which the psychologist sometimes notes on test scores often goes without further diagnosis or educational planning. A child thus may become by default a member of a class for mentally retarded children when all else appears to have failed to meet his needs in regular classes.

8. Accidents, infections, or diseases resulting in physical or emotional problems. Social welfare workers well know the familiar pattern of the less intelligent clients who form a high percentage of the statistics related to the above factors. Ensuing trauma and debilitating factors pusue many of these families year after year.

9. Inappropriate educational pressures before the child is ready. When the "teachable moment" has been bypassed and the child's normal motivation for learning at his developmental level has been ignored, serious consequences result.

10. Emotional disturbances related to above or other factors. Eli M. Bower, in his speech at the White House Conference on Children and Youth in 1960, stated the importance of early identification: "There is little doubt that emotional maladjustment or adjustment cannot be studied as a discrete illness such as pneumonia or scarlet fever. It can only be regarded as a complex interwoven relationship of the organism with himself and his environment . . . research points to the fact that teachers, pediatricians, and others can, with some help, make good judgments about the adjustment capacities of children. The problem is how to synthesize the different kinds of information and put the various perceptual parts, like Humpty-Dumpty, back together again."

11. The absence of drive, inner urge, or motivation, existent but not traceable to any of the factors listed above. Teachers, agencies, physicians, and neighbors can often suggest what might well be the real reason for a child's problem when the symptoms fit into what an article in the Saturday Evening Post called the "battered child syndrome," and what is otherwise labeled "neglect and abuse."

The causation problem becomes more complicated when one recognizes that many thousands of children who possess one or a combination of these factors are not slow learners. A "plus factor" thus enters the picture. There is a need for recognizing that slowness does not inevitably result from a particular setting or circumstance, but is the outcome of an inherited quality and/or environmental conditions as they join and affect a child.

Adding to the difficulties are increasingly involved problems of parental despair and subjectivity, teacher pressures more intensively applied to a child because of limited time and increased responsibilities (and despite dedication), and the instilled feeling that one cannot learn. Recognizing the causes and adapting solutions to them are basic in our approach to the slow child.

A distinction must be made between slow learning due to inherent causes and the kind due to our own limitations of evaluation or environment. When a child performs in the 75 to 90 IQ range because he is cerebral palsied and has limited manipulative skills, a correction factor must be considered before judgments are made. When a child with a language problem or from a culture different from that on which a particular test was validated acquires a low score, additional work must be done to secure an accurate evaluation for him. Merely translating the test into his language may not be sufficient, because of his cultural and socioeconomic deviations. Of course, it is important to remember that in some cases our inadequacies may be the major factor involved, but in other cases the children may actually be slow-learning due to various indentifiable reasons.

Additional areas of pseudo slow learning include bright children working not only beneath their capacity but also below the so-called normal, and children with emotional or physical problems. Individualized educational programs based on accurate child study are needed for these children as well as for all others performing at a slower than average rate.

Practically all the professional literature on slow learners is devoted to children with an intelligence range of approximately 75 to 90 IQ, or those performing at that level despite indications of higher capabilities. However, there is a significant number of children whose educational neglect has been great, whose potentialities as contributing members of a democratic society are strong, and who literally are "slow learners." They are the bright children working below their considerable capacities and learning more slowly than they are capable of doing. They are the undermotivated, underachieving students who tragically add to our educational dropout rate, the ones whom some schools overlook when they attempt to set up programs for gifted children who are able and ambitious. Ability is there, but the ambition may be limited or lacking.

Riessman states that teachers need two approaches: (1) Understand the child, and (2) understand the way subject matter can best be taught to him. If teachers are to be skillful at adapting for individual instruction, they need considerable training in the research and practice already garnered in areas like transfer of learning, motivation, and learning theory. They must have knowledge of who the children are, what their backgrounds are, and how school programs can meet their needs, and solve their problems. This is necessary for all children—even more essential for the children of poverty.

The teacher may be limited in his efforts because of class size, a shortage of specialized help, and a failure of his own background to include the specifics of "individual differences." In addition, a problem related to slow learning may be magnified if the teacher expects average work from below-average children, retains average standards, or uses the techniques of fear and punishment to create abilities that may be nonexistent. A vicious circle may evolve: The child is low and becomes lower because of the unrealistic pressures involved, and the lowering and pressuring continue.

Riessman makes a strong point of the need to stop underestimating the underprivileged. Sources for change will in the end be more effective if they spring from the needs of the people involved. This requires that educators work with the other positive forces existing in the lives of the slow learner. It also means a focus different from that which traditional and subject-centered teachers have used as chief motivation for school success. It means building upon the positive values of the subcultures and minority groups. It means understanding the roots of prejudice and their corroding effects upon the slow learner. It means building respect for achievement. It means building upon the promising research which looks for recognition of creativity and for new ways of learning. It means that the quality of education and its respect for democratic values must remain as the focus.

Bilingual Children

A few years ago Dr. George Sanchez of the University of Texas was asked: "What are the main causes of problems encountered by bilingual children?" His reply was language, culture, and socioeconomic conditions. "Which is the most serious?" He answered: "Socioeconomic conditions, by far."

A 3-year study was recently completed at Arizona State University which nailed down a fallacy too often perpetuated by teachers and others who should know better. It is that there is a limited capacity for knowledge somehow inherent among so-called bilingual children. Actually, they are often "unilingual," but in a language other than English. Their language, as well as cultural and socioeconomic differences may be reflected in school records that seem to indicate mental limitations. But are such limitations real or pseudo? Do they reflect limitations in the children's capacities—or in the tests that are used which are not valid for these children?

Several of the conclusions of this study are revealing:

1. The median number of siblings per family in the study was approximately twice the national average, and more than 9 percent of the children came from families with 10 or more children.

2. Almost 10 percent of the fathers for whom information was available had no schooling, and only 4 percent had completed high school.

3. The median family income of $2,161 placed these families in the lowest quartile nationally, with 50 percent of the children from homes with annual

family incomes of $1,686 to $3,900. The income range was $900 to $8,000, and the source of support extended from public assistance, part-time cotton picking, and other unskilled jobs to full-time employment in the skilled crafts and business ownership.

4. In one school the children on the average were retarded a full year on the basis of age in grade when they entered first grade. In all three schools studied the children were behind their contemporaries academically by the time they reached second grade.

5. Bilingual children included in this study appeared to be retarded in both achievement (reading, language, and arithmetic) and ability (performance and verbal).

A New Educational Approach

Recently a top school administrator was asked why his large school system wasn't trying out some of the newer educational techniques and materials. "You know how 'the Establishment' is," he replied.

In those five words he was being highly critical of many members of his profession for their lack of creativity, unwillingness to experiment, and fear of the new. Business, medicine, and the military have clearly demonstrated that they will not tolerate the generation delay referred to in the beginning of this paper.

The proof is in how fast industry and the armed services have latched onto "Programed Learning," one of the most promising of the newer teaching approaches. Because it had direct values for children who are antagonistic toward school, those from poverty areas, slow learners, and pseudo slow learners, it is an excellent example of an educational breakthrough now available but seldom used by many of our school people.

Through it, industry knows how it can improve instruction, increase learning, reduce training time, and save money. They cut corners on both spending and inefficiency. IBM, A.T. & T., Hughes Aircraft, du Pont, and the pharmaceutical and insurance fields are just a few who are part of the "Who's Who" of big business already profiting from "Programed Learning."

But not the schools.

The military—and especially the Air Training Command—have saved countless hours and dollars by converting much of their training material to the programed approach, encouraging and guaranteeing learning where earlier it came slowly or not at all.

But not the schools.

Your schools need those objectives as much as, if not more than, industry does, and yet they have largely ignored the technique. They have spent less than $1 on it for every $8 business has spent. Fewer than 1 in 200 children are exposed to it.

What is this technique that is far beyond the experimental stage? That industry, and military, and government use in quantity? That can partially provide a solution to the teacher shortage, burgeoning student enrollments, ever-increasing school taxes, and negative attitudes toward school of many deprived children? And that most school people treat with a passive, disdainful, or outright antagonistic attitude?

"Programed Learning" offers a new self-instructional approach to school subjects. It takes parts of the curriculum, such as mapreading, use of the dictionary, the Bill of Rights, how to forecast the weather, and other segments of it, and reduces them to small logical steps, and involves the student directly and actively.

It is an approach that can be adapted directly to help meet the communication, health, vocational, and citizenship needs of the children we are talking about at this conference.

It submits these facts from its extensive research:

1. There is more evidence of its effectiveness than any other instructional method has been able to demonstrate. Where are the data of textbooks, film, educational television—yes, and even teacher–effectiveness to compare with the learning proof provided by this technique?

2. It insures more learning, retained longer and gained in less time than the same kind of information obtained through conventional teaching techniques.

3. The child can move ahead successfully at his own rate with an immediate check on his answers. He usually enjoys the process, and takes a step toward teaching himself, planting the seeds of independent study and scholarship, as well as responsible citizenship.

4. It has a special contribution to make to the culturally and economically deprived, the children and young adults for whom education has in the past often meant frustration and disappointment. Through this technique it can finally mean success, stimulation, and a desire to learn.

Some school administrators and teachers have freely stated their objections to "Programed Learning" and at the same time exposed their fear of what they don't understand:

"It will replace the teacher." The displacement fear is an old tale. It was also shouted when educational films came in, and is the reflection of an insecure profession that has never quite won the respect it deserves.

"It dehumanizes learning." To which one might ask, "Which results in more conformity, mediocrity, and 'dehumanizing'—individualizing instruction through this technique, or teaching all children the same thing at the same time in groups or classes?"

"The programs are poor." Some of them no doubt are less effective than others, but so are some textbooks and teachers. Does that mean we dispose of all of them?

"It's a machine and there's no place in education for a mechanical approach." The unfortunate "teaching machine" term got us off to a false start, and now even though practically all programs are in self-contained booklets, the scare persists.

"They are too expensive." Reusable programs are plentifully available for slightly over $1 each. Programs for the poverty groups can be prepared and also made available at figures like this.

"They are just another textbook or workbook." Try to find either a textbook or workbook that is self-teaching, logically organized, and thoroughly tested prior to publication. When soundly prepared programs are released, their publishers know that they teach what they say they do. For what textbooks can that claim be made, and have it stick.

"You can't fight 'the Establishment.'" It is ironic that the major decision-makers in our schools—administrators and school boards—provide most of the obstinacy when it comes to innovation. They have the authority, but not necessarily the imagination or creativity to move into new areas. Unfortunately, buildings, equipment, and supplies are all more comfortable subjects for discussion than is a challenging new teaching method.

Two intensive publishers' surveys recently showed strong approval by the relatively few school people who use programs, and negative skepticism by those who do not. They also showed widespread buckpassing within the schools, an intricate back and forth pattern involving teachers, boards, administrators, curriculum people, audio-visual persons, and many, many committees seeking an evasive kind of consensus before trying a new idea. Another national study resulted in an overwhelming stamp of approval by both teachers and students who had programed learning experience.

A tragic waste exists in this era when school taxes, crowded classrooms, and inept teaching are all under attack—and a technique is available to help combat these negative factors. Because vested interests put too much restraint on change, others must get into the act.

Money May Bring New Problems

The funds will be available to help solve some of the educational problems in our pockets of poverty. But they may bring additional problems like these:

1. One respected research man was recently quoted as saying, "Here are the application forms! Let's dream up a project or an institute." Jacques Barzun wrote an article a few years ago called "Cults of Research and Creativity" (Harper's, October 1960). Unfortunately we have an increasing number of people who propose research that has no relationship at all to need, but instead to a perpetuation of their own income or status. And they hope governmental agencies will allocate their funds by the end of each fiscal year, even if such allocation is made to unworthy projects.

2. All of us have been impressed and fascinated by expensive mechanisms, but it may be that inexpensive published "programed learning" materials are far more effective and practical than the button-pushing machines, and they are certainly far less costly! Elaborate approaches have an attraction for people even though they may be unaware of how to use them adequately, how they fit into the total educational framework, and what their limitations are.

3. The trend toward a research emphasis may tend to downgrade the importance of the teacher. We have to be on guard!

The Teacher[2]

All of our children deserve an education up to their capacities. In our poverty areas especially, many are falling far short. The teacher remains the center of the entire situation, the core of all learning.

Their selection and preparation, the encouragement they need to try new materials and techniques, the salaries they deserve for holding the most important job in our country—these are among the areas demanding our attention during the months immediately ahead. How we can attract, prepare, and keep the most highly qualified persons in this profession, how we can get more of them into communities where poverty, dropouts and pseudo slow learning exist, these are the tasks calling for our help right now.

Teachers cannot insulate themselves from a world that wavers back and forth on the brink of final disaster. The caves of Cuba, the battle for Katanga, and disturbances in Vietnam become backdrops for a first grader learning to read, a sixth grader studying longitude and latitude, and a college student looking toward a career.

The role of the teacher in these years of education (and worldwide) revolution couldn't be more exciting—a different kind of teacher is demanded to play that role. Not the girl who is biding her time till marriage, not the mother who "might just as well teach" because her children need her less now, not the young man who can't make a go of it in the other marketplaces—these are unfortunately with us in huge numbers, but they cannot be the cornerstone of our professional strength.

For a moment let's look at the present and immediate future in education. Then perhaps the personnel needs of the profession will fall into place. These are the years of Rickover, Rafferty, and Conant, of Federal aid, phonics, and integration, of team teaching, programed instruction, and educational television. Yet this is the era that gives little more than lip service to the "knowledge explosion" ("try it again—what are the names of the new countries in Africa?") that has only begun to meet the challenge of the neglected gifted child, that has just started to recognize the tragedy of starvation, illiteracy, and infant mortality which permeate much of the earth's surface.

The frontier of the classroom demands leaders, creative spirits, persons eager to do battle against unfairness, narrowness, and ignorance, whether among little children or the world society that keeps butting its way into our daily lives.

We need teachers prepared to teach children of poverty, who understand their background and problems and resent the indignities they impose.

In Summary

Only a few of our present educational deficiencies have been itemized here. All have serious implications for the problems of poverty, not only in the Southwest but throughout the nation.

Keeping the dropouts in school by eliminating the reasons why they feel compelled to leave;

Preparing appropriate new educational materials for our slow learners and pseudo slow learners;

"Getting at" the educational problems of the so-called bilingual child;

Using what we already have, the practical approach of rigorously prepared "Programed Learning" materials, for example, and not letting fearful school administrators and teachers scare us off;

Respecting and improving the status of the teacher, now and for always the most important agent for progress in the education of our children;

These are just a few thoughts on educational deficiencies as they exist today. Their implications for the problems pinpointed at this conference are deep and demanding of our immediate action.

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY GEORGE BRYANT, FORT YUMA, ARIZ., CAP

I am George Bryant, Fort Yuma, Ariz., community action program, P.O. Box 890, Yuma, Ariz., and I wish to make a few comments concerning Headstart programs.

Indian Headstart programs started with a great faith and need. The faith was that Indian people are capable, willing, and anxious to administer education programs for their young children. The need of Indian Headstart programs was great.

---

[2] Passages in this section are from "A Time for Teaching" by Willard Abraham, Harper & Row, 1964.

In June of 1965 Arizona State University began by training the first 55 of the hundreds of teacher aids. Pimas, Maricopas, Sioux, and Navajos worked diligently for 8 weeks. These Indian people returned to their respective reservations and began carrying out a brand new educational program. They built furniture from scraps of anything they could find. Some communities constructed log rooms. Others borrowed church buildings or any room available. They assumed total responsibility for their young children in preschools. Indian people searched for teachers. Since teachers were few, many times the Indian teacher aid carried these programs.

As one aid writes:

You may be pleasantly surprised if you realize your hope of coming to our school. You will find that our Community Action program is literally to the word because we have integrated our neighbors into our tribal program thus providing a partial solution of working together in the future and among the different peoples of the nation.

We Quechan are working toward the righting of many wrongs that were done in the past. Yet, we who are thinking in terms of future dealings know that we must cast aside some of the old social attitudes in order to compete on a level with others who are not hampered with living duo-lives such as ours and the many tribes throughout this nation.

One writes:

Let me take you back with me about a year ago. I was then a drunk. It got so bad that I spent a lot of time locked up and this had been going on for years. Last April, my oldest sister died and she was the one who really cared what happened to me. She always said that I could do much good if I could only leave the alcohol alone. She had the faith then that I lacked and when she passed away, it was then up to me to find myself. It was agony to quit drinking so abruptly and it still is a miracle that I got through that first month without cracking up.

In the meantime, there was this opening for teacher aid so, surprisingly, many people believed in me and backed me up. Our training up there helped me very much and it was in fighting my way back that brought me in contact with a lot of good people like you.

If you ever meet someone who seems disappointed and discouraged just tell them about an old drunk who fought his way back from failure.

It was a surprise to know that there's a great deal of people who will boost anyone who makes an effort to better themselves.

This and the love of the children and finding a place in community life among my people are reward enough even though nothing else may come my way.

I have passed a Headstart of my own and face the future with a better outlook.

Such a program must continue to motivate such Indian people. America can afford no less.

Thank you very much for allowing me to present my statement.

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY LEONARD C. BURCH, TRIBAL CHAIRMAN, SOUTHERN UTE TRIBE, COLORADO

The Southern Ute Community Action Agency is working for the interests of 818 Indians (Ute, Navajo, and others), 451 Spanish Americans and 1,087 Anglos, a total of 2,356 persons or 681 families, all of whom live in rural areas. Of these 681 families, 357 or 53 percent have incomes below the poverty level. At the present time the heads of almost 400 families are unemployed because what work is available in the areas is seasonal. Because of these statistics, poverty due to lack of employment is of primary concern and attempts are being made to initiate some types of locally developed industries on a year-round basis through the efforts of the Tribal Economic Development Committee as well as components of the community action agency. It is anticipated that the former committee will expand to a committee representing all groups in the community.

We find the educational attainment level of all persons in the economically deprived groups to be quite low. These persons, lacking in basic educational knowledge, skills, and understanding, will continue to be poor because they lack the fundamental tools to be otherwise. This community can never prosper unless its human resources are in possession of these tools. Without education of its people it will continue to be blighted with poverty unless positive measures are taken. With few exceptions, the need, interest and desire for education, job skills, and occupational opportunities have been fully and enthusiastically expressed by the adults in these disadvantaged families.

Of next major concern is the child from Indian, Spanish, and rural Anglo cultural background. This child is not fully understood by the teacher who, because of inadequate preparation in this area, lacks cross-cultural knowledge and understanding. Because of this lack, these children gradually lose interest, refuse to participate, and quite often eventually drop out of school. However, this lack of cross-cultural understanding is not limited to teachers. The people residing within the community and, more especially, the leaders in each ethnic group lack rapport with the other groups. This situation is peculiar to few reservations in the United States but in the Ignacio area of the Southern Ute Reservation the community action agency is attempting through specially designed projects to bring all the groups of people together in a joint cooperative effort aimed at helping erase the poverty that presently exists. This is being done not only in the projects themselves but in the manner in which we operate on a day-to-day basis. Our CAP board of directors has equal representation from all ethnic groups and we are carrying on a series of meetings in which the CAP board meets with other boards in the community, i.e., the board of trustees of the town of Ignacio, the school board, the Southern Ute Tribal Council, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs employees, etc. In one of the CAP projects, if approved, a key leadership training conference for representatives of each cultural group to be brought together for instruction and exchange of ideas should establish cross-cultural and intergroup relationships that will be applied practically upon their return to the community.

Through the Southern Ute Community Action Agency and the Southern Ute Tribe we are establishing (if our projects are approved) a regional planning board (the overall economic development committee), a local community services center which will provide employment counseling and loan advisory services for farmers and small businessmen. It can be expanded (if Washington permits) to include a local credit union.

Community cooperation that is slowly developing here is perhaps spawned because of the desperation of the local people. However, this cooperation and enthusiasm is dampened somewhat by the miles of redtape that must be followed in order to bring Federal assistance funds into the community. The community is ready now, and particularly the Indian segment of the population, to jump in and work hard to better itself, but it must wait for the agencies on the Federal level. For example, one of our projects has been transferred from the Indian desk of OEO to the Department of Labor. This project, which would provide employment for part of the unemployed segment of the people, will probably be delayed because of the aforementioned transfer. Another project which will provide adult literacy education to all the persons involved in the other projects has been transferred from the Indian desk to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, where it is apparently held up indefinitely because of the necessity for them to develop guidelines for this type of project. These transfers are delaying the total community effort at an extremely critical period.

We understood that the Indian desk was established to assist Indian tribes in obtaining direct help without having to compete with the many thousands of non-Indian groups and that the Indian desk is staffed with persons who understand the special needs and problems of the Indian people. These other agencies that are now receiving some of the Indian projects are bound to create confusion and problems for individual Indian CAP agencies and cannot possibly have the special understanding and interest required for coping with Indian problems.

We would like to recommend that direct assistance be resumed on all Indian projects under OEO and that assistance be expanded on the Indian desk for other Federal projects such as manpower development, U.S. Public Health services, projects under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, agricultural projects, and projects under the Economic Development Act. If all projects for Indian reservations could be funneled into one agency such as the Indian desk at OEO we feel that the interests of the Indian people would be served more adequately.

We would also like to suggest that the original concepts of community action be restored before it is too late—those of originality, people involvement, and with a minimum of bureaucracy. There seems to be a tendency to emphasize "canned" or "packaged" programs. Each community, whether it be Indian or non-Indian or both, is unique in its problems and therefore must develop its own original remedies. We would like to return to the "building block" approach, using maximum participation by the poor people.

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY TOMMY CLAYTON, MARANA, ARIZ.

Certain areas of American agriculture are in a real tight spot despite all efforts on the part of the Government to improve agriculture's economic position. As so often seems to be the case, the efforts by Government on behalf of agriculture in general, and the small family-size farmers in particular, have not been entirely successful, at least in this area. To explain: It has been my understanding for years that Government policies toward agriculture have been intended to encourage the maintenance of the family unit. But the fact is, in Pima County, Ariz., the number of farms has declined since the last census, and the size of the remaining farms has increased. I personally know a dozen or more people who were farming in my community a few years ago but now they are gone to the city, or somewhere else, to find jobs.

I think it is noteworthy that in 1966, we sold grain for less money than we have in several years despite the talk of shortages, and the price outlook for 1967 is not better.

In the 1966-67 crop year, cotton sold for about 19 cents per pound; plus the Government payment of about 14 cents per pound making a total of 33 cents per pound. Western cotton has sold for 33 cents or more for many years and without the mandatory 35 percent cut in acreage necessary to receive the price support payment under the 1965 agriculture act.

These static or lowering prices and decreasing allotments coupled with increasing costs in production and living have, indeed, caught many farmers in a squeeze. Can nonfarm business absorb the farmer and farmworkers that this cost-price squeeze is forcing off the farms? Will society be better off when broke farmers join the unemployed city folk?

Secondly, there is another group of rural people who I believe are even worse off than the small farmers in this area. I refer to the farmworkers—the people who do the work of raising and harvesting America's bounty. The farmworkers in this area are not transients; most of them have lived here for many years; many of them have worked for the same employer for many years, and the workers are as destitute now as they were when they started. Society has left them behind. Their level of education is substandard; their income is substandard; their housing is substandard; and their future prospects are bleak indeed. As I see their situation, the future consists of working 12 hours a day, 7 days a week until they are too old to work any more, living in the poorest of conditions, doing without many necessities of life, unable to help their children get an education, and then retiring; retiring to even less with the meager social security payments they shall receive.

It is a known fact that until the last 2 or 3 years, these workers received as little as 50 cents an hour for their labor in some cases, although the majority receive 80 cents to $1 an hour, and in a few cases some were paid $1.25. At such wages the farmworker was and is forced to work 80 to 90 hours per week just to keep body and soul together.

I think it is worth mentioning that for many years some farmers made a good deal of money. I know some who were able to pay cash for additional acreage; deals where hundreds of thousands of dollars changed hands. Other farmers in this area have made large investments in other States from farm profit. Yet those who were the most able to pay a living wage have been the most reluctant to do so. It is not uncommon to hear a farmer complain about the amount of income taxes he has to pay. I want to make it clear that I am not against farmers making money or investing their profits to make more money. However, it seems to me that the people who have grown the crops, who ate the dust, endured the cold, suffered the long hours, all the while living in absolute poverty, should have shared a little more in the profits of the operation. The sad truth is that many of the farmers have exploited the very people who have helped them the most.

Federal wage laws are helping to a small degree. But some of the farmers say plainly that if they are forced to pay any higher wages (over $1 an hour) that they are going to charge rent for the shacks they provide their help. Thus the worker is going to remain in a desperate plight. The small increase he may receive in wages is going to be offset by rent if the growers make their threats good. If the worker tried to move to a decent house in town and pay the rent required, from his meager wages, he would be even worse off as far as being able to feed and clothe his family.

A man, a real man, doesn't mind going without for a time; he doesn't mind working 80 or 90 hours a week for a time; but if this is all he has to look forward to for as long as he lives, his future is truly dark and gloomy.

I could tell you of workers who after putting in the day in the fields, do not have the facilities to take a shower; who must still use the out-house, who must receive surplus commodities to meet their dietary requirements.

Certainly, I do not want to give the impression that all the farmers have mistreated their help. That would not be true. And I am not ignorant of the difficulties the farmer faces, but nevertheless, the farmer could have, and should be, doing more for his employees than he has, or is, presently doing. Nor do I think that the Government should give these farmworkers something for nothing. I know of nothing that will ruin a man faster, rob him of his initiative more completely, than to support him for doing nothing. However, I do want to make this Commission aware that a real problem exists, a problem for which there is no solution in sight; and yet, a solution must be found.

Americans take pride in their compassion for the less fortunate; we don't want to see a child in India go hungry; we would not take comfort in our enemies starving. How dare we then feast at our tables while Lazarus lies outside the gate pleading for help! It is a pitiful sight to see a family of 10 or 12 living in a two-room shack; a shack devoid of the barest sanitary facilities.

But this problem is so complex that emotion will not solve it. It is so complex that the farmers by themselves cannot solve it. Indeed, the farmers in many cases need help themselves. The farmer, the farmworkers, local, State, and Federal Government can solve it; if they work together; if they really want to. The poverty-aid program is helping some of the needy, but it appears that a good deal of the money is going to pay administrative salaries. The program has also aroused considerable hostility among farmers and farm-related business; they feel the poverty program is taking their workers away from the farms and other jobs where workers are needed at a very low salary, and for very long hours. These few words do not tell the whole story, but I trust they will give the Commission a preview of our problems.

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY MARCUS CORIZ, CAP EMPLOYEE, SANTO DOMINGO PUEBLO, N. MEX.

I am Marcus Coriz. I am 45 years of age and an employee of CAP, and a resident of Santo Domingo Pueblo, N. Mex.

The oldsters are very proud to be working. The people are waking up and just beginning to understand. Everybody is coming to us and we are in a position to help. We have the equipment, tools, manpower, and the willingness to help and work.

Our arms are stretched out to help our community. Right now we are a maintenance crew, we help the Headstart program, the people, the other programs and the tribal council. The BIA, PHS, and the people can tell you how we help them.

The project has given us the spirit and all of us are helping each other to move ahead for better health and better living. Some of the men have been on county and BIA assistance. We have relieved the burden and others are now being helped by them.

There should be more money so that more people can be brought into the program. There are many more in the village that are the same as we are—poor.

In the spring, things will begin to pop and there will be more projects than we can handle. There is no way we can express, but to say the project should not die out, it is a great thing to us; we are 100 percent for it and for the first time, OEO has reached us poor people and because of employment, we are able to buy food, clothing, and pay our debts and get education.

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY JEAN M. EMRICK, TUCSON, ARIZ.

SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS AT THE FARM LABOR CAMP AT SAHUARITA, ARIZ.

The farm labor camp at Sahuarita, Ariz., is fairly typical of such camps located in the southwestern part of the United States. There are a few which appear to be in better condition and several, especially in California, which are much worse.

I have been working with the people of Sahuarita for the past 5 years. This work is being done under the auspices of the Arizona Migrant and Indian Ministry. During the course of these 5 years a multitude of things concerning the economic and social condition of these people has come to my attention. These things have forced themselves upon my conscience as conditions that are inequitable and that could and should be remedied. The inevitable questions now are:

1. What exactly are these conditions?
2. How can these conditions be remedied?
3. Who should accept the responsibility for attempting to change them?

Obviously no one person has all the answers to all these questions, but 5 years of constant exposure to the conditions at Sahuarita compel me to add some of the information I have to the total picture of rural poverty in the Southwest.

The ethnic makeup of Sahuarita is as follows: 10 percent Indian, 62 percent Mexican American, 24 percent Negro, and 4 percent Anglo. The majority of the farmhands, those who pick cotton and help irrigate, earn about $90 every 2 weeks. Those men who drive the tractors or heavy equipment may earn as much $150 every 2 weeks. According to an Arizona public health survey, only 23 percent of all principal wage earners in the area earn $3,000 a year or more. Thirty-three percent of the persons have a per capita income of less than $300 a year cash income. The men can work only when the weather is good. If the winter is especially rainy, as was the case in 1965-66, they have little work and therefore little income. They have no income at all if the weather does not permit them to work. There is no sick leave or sick pay. Many of the men work 12 hours a day, 7 days a week.

In Sahuarita about 26 percent of the families receive surplus commodities from the Government. One problem which has arisen is that not all of the persons eligible to receive these surplus commodities are able to find transportation into Tucson to pick up their supplies. Welfare assistance is received by about 20 percent of the people.

There are approximately 50 families comprising the Sahuarita cotton camp area. The size of the average family is six persons. Over one-half of the homes are extremely crowded and many families live eight or nine persons to two rooms. The homes in the camp are barracks style with nothing to distinguish one from the other except an occasional bit of grass or flowers. These homes are very unattractive. They have no insulation and the doors do not fit properly. Keeping out drafts is a problem. The ceilings are almost all partial ceilings and it is hard to keep in what heat there is. The gas to these units is furnished by the grower, but the people have to furnish their own gas heaters. Some can afford the heaters and others cannot. Those who cannot afford the gas heaters either buy a wood-burning stove or have no heat. The families who have wood-burning stoves must buy or find their own wood to burn. Finding wood to burn in a nonforested area such as the Arizona desert can be quite a chore. I have heard that the gas pressure sometimes is very low. There are some families which have little or no heat throughout the whole winter. Sanitation at the Sahuarita camp also leaves something to be desired. A number of the women have told me that there were rats in the homes. They asked to have airtight containers in which to store their staples and surplus commodities to keep the rats from getting into them. There is one unit in the camp containing flush toilet and shower facilities for the whole camp. This is hardly adequate for an area containing that many persons. One of the chief desires of the people is to add at least one more such unit to the camp. The most noticeable aspect with regard to the lack of sanitation is the insufficient number of trash cans and trash burners. Due to this fact, there is always trash piled up in various places where dogs and children can strew it about.

Sahuarita is fortunate in that it has an excellent school system. The children are offered a very good elementary and high school education. However, it is not too uncommon for some of the parents to keep their children home for no better reason than to babysit. I understand that there is no truant officer working in this area. Only 62 percent of the mothers can read English and over one-half of these learned English from their school children. Very few, approximately two or three, of the young people in this area have gone on to college in the past 5 years.

In the area of health, two things are outstanding. There is a high rate of colds and respiratory infections and a high rate of dental caries. The dental problems are due to certain dietary deficiencies. The high rate of colds and respiratory infections is not surprising considering how cold these homes can get in the winter. Last year we had one very small baby in the hospital with pneumonia because the heat in the home wouldn't work properly. The children may receive free dental care once a month, but the school nurse must transport them 90 miles round trip in order to take advantage of this.

There appears to be a score of stop-gap or temporary measures to remedy some of these situations. These methods may in the long run make matters even worse. I think that a lot of forethought and good planning are needed to work out a suitable solution for areas such as Sahuarita. My own recommendations would be as follows:

1. A State minimum wage law applying to farm laborers—a law which would require a certain number of paid sick days.
2. Better State inspection of housing—enforcing existing housing codes.
3. Public Health Department should in some way require the grower to supply better sanitation facilities and better heat supply.
4. Find a way to get the surplus commodities distributed to all who qualify.
5. A bimonthly or monthly mobile dental clinic should be made available to service this area.
6. If monies cannot be obtained through the Federal Government under the OEO, a Federal grant should be administered by a project director well acquainted with the problems peculiar to the Sahuarita area.
7. The local school board should offer more variety of evening courses, including an English language course, for the adults.
8. A full-time in-residence social worker should be employed to consult with the people and help them take advantage of already existing opportunities and agencies—especially Federal or State facilities for manpower retraining. This retraining aspect is particularly important as the particular work these men are doing is going to be demanded less and less during the next few years.

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY ELSIE FULWILDER, MOTHER OF EIGHT CHILDREN, TUCSON, ARIZ.

I am Elsie Fulwilder, mother of eight children, and I am age 34. My husband's name is Gordon Fulwilder. I have eight children from 2 to 15 years of age. Our income before CAP was $160 per month and I worked as a maid and my husband did yard work.

Before CAP programs were available, it used to be that we had very hard times when our food would not last, but we tried to stretch our supplies so that our children could have something to eat. There were times when we didn't know how we were going to be able to get money for food for our family. A lot of times we knew that if we had somebody teach us so that we could get better jobs we would be able to make more money to get the things that we needed to provide for our children.

We know that it is because of our quitting school and no more training of any kind that we weren't able to get better jobs.

I was asked how I felt being in this poverty condition. I was in despair, broke down, and cried. I stated, "There are times I didn't know what to do except pray to God that somehow things would turn out right. This type of living is nothing that anybody would understand unless they know and see their children go without as I have seen mine. It is for the children that we need things and which we can't get unless we have money." When my husband wasn't working steady, I felt that he didn't know what to do to overcome our condition. This idleness caused him to drink.

All people that have not lived the life that we have lived, will not understand what I am saying.

My husband is now getting training under Title V. It is much better for us now; the education that we lack is something that we never realized could mean so much to us.

Food commodities are now being provided for us. This comes in handy when times are hard. I know if we could train for better jobs that things would be better.

Our expenses for our children who go to public school are such that sometimes we don't have the money for meal tickets, and our children have to go without any lunch. We still owe for the schoolbooks for our oldest child in high school.

I don't have anything against the CAP programs. Only if my husband, who is now getting training, could be paid at least twice a month instead of once a month, it would not be so hard for us to make ends meet. We get along somehow, but it would be better if this could be changed.

I wish to thank you people for allowing me to present my testimony.

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY DEAN HINES, CONFEDERATED TRIBES AND BANDS, YAKIMA INDIAN NATION, TOPPENISH, WASH.

I have been ask to say how I think OEO helps my people.

Poverty is many things like there is poverty in health and also there is poverty in schooling and there is poverty in being clean and there is poverty in happiness. We have all of these things on the reservation. Poverty is more than money poverty.

OEO helps people to learn good things about health and now our homes are clean and pretty and our babies don't get sick like before and the families are getting happy. Also a summer school at summer camp last summer was a good thing for our teens and it was because OEO helped us out. Our boys and girls see that school is fun and good and they catch up on non-Indian boys and girls. Now we hope they stay and finish up school. We did not hope before. OEO helps fathers to know about work and jobs and they get a paycheck; not much, but every little bit helps you know and the family feels good now because the father has a good check coming in. This is the way I see OEO and we are hoping you will vote for it to stay on the books at least 2 or 3 yrs. because it is a good thing for us.

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY EVERETT JACKSON, UNEMPLOYED, SACATON, ARIZ.

I am Everett Jackson, of Sacaton, Ariz., age 37, married with seven children. I am presently unemployed.

I have not been back home long, just returned in September. They told me that they did not expect my mother to pull through an operation and that my father was also ill so I came home. I do not know much about OEO and its programs and whether or not I like it. I do know a little about Title V and feel that my not knowing about the programs is my own fault as I have not attended any of the community meetings.

I do like the BIA relocation program. It's education and you can pick up experience. I didn't know anything about warehouse work but I learned all that. And I didn't know anything about order filling but learned that too. From the way they talked, they would get us a good job. But they didn't get anything to start with. A lot of factories don't pay too much. I didn't like that nor standing in one spot for 8 hours. I worked myself up, until I came home. I stayed 3 years with the same company. If I ever went back, I could go and see them, they would put me back to work. The housing is so high you can't afford it. That's what got us, the housing. A lot of the apartments are not fit to live in. They have all kinds of rats and the walls are full of holes and I had to patch these. Otherwise we would be there yet, if we had a reasonable place to live.

I don't think I could go back now, though, with the size of the family. Although Mr. Pratt has told me once that I was eligible.

Since my return I have been looking for employment, but there is no way I can get a job in Sacaton. I don't think there will be any kind of jobs here. I have applied for work with the CAP office, Coolidge, and Allis-Chalmers. Also, Mr. Henderson from Title V is supposed to come to see me sometime this week. If Mr. Henderson doesn't have anything I will go back to irrigating for Pima Community Farms. That's what I did before.

I attended the meeting at the preschool, and we were talking about recreation. They have no one to work with the children. A lot of these guys won't go out for nothing. They have the fair grounds. I took a walk over there one afternoon and found the rest rooms in bad shape. They could have a caretaker for the place, to clean up and take care of it. It's a job for somebody that could be created right here. If there was some type of plant on the reservation I think it would take care of employment for a few.

I would like to see my children go on and finish their education, as I didn't. Go on to college, if funds are available so they can do better. Most everybody wants to make money so they can afford the things that they don't have now.

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY KERN COUNTY COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM COMMITTEE, INC., BAKERSFIELD, CALIF.

Kern County, Calif., is primarily an agricultural county. Approximately one-fourth of its rural agriculture population is poor by the standard of $3,000 annual family income. It is the scene of the Bakersfield City government's vote to abolish poverty and the center of the farm workers' unionization drive.

Without exception I would like to state that present programing and methods of programing, whether HEW, OEO (with Title II-A and III-B) or FHA has not substantially assisted rural farmworkers in eliminating their poverty condition. The impact is either superficial (in the case of child care which only releases the parents to continue working under substandard conditions), or too "long range" so results cannot be judged, or too piecemeal for total poverty.

The problems are all interrelated. They are: (1) Lack of education, and literacy either dialect English or Spanish speaking, (2) no job skills or training facilities, and (3) no jobs, even if training was available, in rural areas except for declining farmwork. The results are that many, especially the young, go to the urban areas with no skills nor ability to cope with the urban situation or take advantage of any possible opportunities.

There are environmental problems also. Housing is totally inadequate, both in construction and space, which does not allow for study by children or for health standards to be maintained. Sewage and waste disposal facilities are generally lacking. Presently I am working with a "colony" south of Shafter, Calif., on this problem. But no Federal or State agency has either been able or willing to assist. Water is often unsafe. Allenworth's (Calif.) water supply has traces of arsenic, and the South Wasco, Calif., water supply has oil and other filth in it. The Delano, Calif., water may be unfit for consumption by infants.

FHA and Title III-B purport to address rural problems. However, neither, to date, have been able to satisfactorily offer any relief. Something more is needed than technical assistance or loans with too rigid standards. People living below a subsistence level cannot either qualify for or repay the loans.

The rural areas of Kern County have an acute shortage of medical facilities and doctors. Presently we are 24 doctors short in this county. The competition for their service and their cost exclude the poor from health and dental care. The Migrant Health Act, Title XIX of the Social Security Act, or the California Cal-Med plan has provided no substantial relief. The Migrant Health Act is perhaps the greatest folly. Its system of funding and requirements exclude it from serving in a direct capacity. This is especially true where doctors are either antipublic health and medical care, as is true in Kern County.

The relationship of rural to urban poverty problems is both direct and obvious. The migration is from rural areas to cities. This migration is logical because cities provide some (perhaps limited) opportunity both for employment and services. Every city generally has public housing, health clinics, and some training. In Kern County one may have to go 60 miles to reach any of these services.

However, the rural person also takes his lack of basic urban skills, his poor health, and his rural methods of sanitation, and too often he finds the urban scene like the rural, only more populated.

To summarize, I believe if one is to resolve the rural poverty problems and eventually the urban poverty problems there must first be a real understanding of the magnitude of the problem. It is bigger than advice or headstarts. It affects every aspect of the victim's life: health, education, family, income, housing, and even longevity. It must be addressed in its totality with the same comprehensive planning and programing common to other areas of national concern such as defense and freeways.

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY HELEN MITCHELL, RECORDING SECRETARY, NATIONAL CONGRESS OF AMERICAN INDIANS, OAKVILLE, WASH.

RURAL POVERTY WITH RESPECT TO AMERICAN INDIANS

As a member of the Quinault Indian Tribe and as an officer of the National Congress of American Indians, I feel that it is incumbent upon me to express myself on this topic. I will speak with reference to my own reservation.

The Quinault Indians are more fortunate than some tribes, in that they have game and fish available to them, and employment is available to some in the forest products industry. However, the conditions which prevail, in spite of these resources, emphasize the real cause of poverty on the reservations.

The conditions to which I refer are deplorable housing, the absence of community centers, poor or nonexistent social services, and little or no business opportunity.

The poor housing conditions exist because building and home improvement loans are not available to persons who reside on trust property. A wage earner cannot accumulate money to finance capital improvements. Some progress is being made toward obtaining special housing programs for the Quinault Tribe.

The absence of community centers is due to the lack of facilities for social and recreational activities, and the ineptness of a transitional culture to fill the vacuum that exists between the old and new ways of life. The Quinault tribal community action program is giving valuable service in these areas. It is providing a recreational program, and educational and vocational counseling services to our Indian communities. Although the social problems of our youth are not wholly solved, they are greatly alleviated through our community action program, and we feel that there is a real moral obligation to continue it.

The lack of community center facilities is a great handicap. The Tribe has no financial resources available for such buildings. We believe that a community building which would house tribal administration offices, club and social activities, youth organizations, athletics, and so forth, is a great need. The Office of Economic Opportunity programs do not provide funds for buildings, but the Quinault community action program is assisting the tribe to present this need to appropriate Federal agencies. This points out the usefulness of the community action organization in giving the tribe technical assistance and counsel in self-development and expressions of need.

An expansion of the above services to include a small business advisory component would provide valuable assistance to the struggling tribal enterprise. It would also encourage individual Indians to find ways of developing trades and business operations within the reservation.

I would be remiss to leave out the educational and health programs which the community action program is providing for our tribe. The Headstart program is eminently successful here. The public schools meet the in-school needs of the students. In addition, our community action program educational counseling component is providing tutoring, parental counseling, and educational and vocational counseling services to our youth.

In 1964, the community conceived and designed a health services program which would meet local needs. It called for a field nurse and medical supervision by U.S. Public Health Service doctors. This program was spelled out in our first community action program application. The Public Health Service received the program so enthusiastically that they built a full-scale medical program around it for our reservation. They are now providing two mobile clinics and a resident physician. The community action program is providing the nurse. This is truly the most effective cooperative program of which I know, and it was developed by us through the assistance of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Please bear in mind that the things I have mentioned here are factors that bear on the causes of poverty. We are not requesting gifts, but services which will enable us to break the shackles of the stifling paternalism which has been imposed on us for so long. So far, the Office of Economic Opportunity is the only Federal agency that has really offered to help us with programs which we have conceived at the local level.

If this kind of help continues and is expanded in the right directions, we have faith that Indian tribes can stand on their own feet—politically, socially, and economically—in our generation.

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY W. F. MURISON, DIRECTOR, CENTER FOR COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT, ARCATA, CALIF.

RURAL POVERTY IN NORTHWEST CALIFORNIA

The comments made and the conclusions drawn will refer specifically to Humboldt County in the north coastal region of California. They may have wider application (Mendocino and Del Norte Counties) but I'm not able to vouch for the wider applicability of my remarks.

Further, these analyses of the poverty situation locally are made in good faith and with an honest effort to be forthright and factual. They represent my own views but are widely representative of opinions and conclusions held locally. As director of the Center for Community Development at Humboldt State College, located in the middle of the region, it has been my fortune to meet and see many of the people about whom we shall be speaking.

There's little to indicate that a rather serious poverty situation exists in this area. The approach to the region from San Francisco is a pleasant and scenic one. Driving over reasonably good roads, one is confronted first by hills covered with vineyards, and further north the magnificent redwood forests provide the traveler or tourist with a natural spectacle without equal. It is a scene of great natural grandeur and evident richness. It seems anomalous, even unseemly, that considerations of human privation and misery be raised in such a setting. But contradictions notwithstanding, the unhappy fact is that there are far too many people unemployed or in receipt of public charity in this most productive of regions.

Population Characteristics (Humboldt County)

The 1960 census showed there to be 104,900 in the county. The 1965 figure showed a population increase of 1,400 in the interim 5-year period, an increase of 1.3 percent or slightly better than one-quarter of 1 percent per annum.

The age class distribution of the population of Humboldt County is as follows:

	Percent
21 years or younger	35.9
22 to 64 years	57.2
65 years or older	6.9

Median age is 26.7 years.

With a population density of 30 per square mile, it might be inferred that the people are widely scattered throughout the extensive land area of the county, larger in area than the combined size of Rhode Island and Delaware. This is not the case, however. Almost half (48.8 percent) of the residents of the area are urban dwellers living in one or another of the cities in the county such as Eureka (the county seat), Arcata, Fortuna, considerably isolated one from the other. Some, it should be pointed out, are rural slums of the worst sort.

Economic Considerations

The main industry in these parts, as might be guessed, is lumber and pulp manufacture; 75 percent of the land area of the county is forested, providing these industries with an abundance of raw material. Traditionally, this area has depended on wood for its economic livelihood and this situation is likely to continue in future years. But there are some notable developments that are worth mentioning.

Lumber manufacture is on the decline, as are the number of small companies engaged in converting logs to boards, studs, and structural members. This is due to a reduction in the amount and availability of merchantable material suitable for conversion to the aforementionied products and to a tendency for large companies to diversify their operations vertically to offset losses incurred in fluctuations in the lumber market. The latter, incidentally, can be very real and very agonizing for local residents.

There has been a heavy investment, better than $100 million, in pulp manufacture in the county. Two new pulp mills have been built in the last 2 years and are now in operation. These are modern and highly automated plants and therefore provide fewer jobs than similar investments in lumber manufacture would or might.

Automation in sawmills—automatic trimmers, electric set-works, even automatic grade selection on the green chain—has reduced the number of men required to produce a thousand board feet of lumber. One cannot blame the manufacturer for increasing the efficiency of his operation or reducing production costs, but such improvements usually result in fewer jobs.

Looking at the forest industries as a whole, it is obvious that there has been a moderate but measurable decline in volume of logs cut and lumber produced. In addition, more of the wood is going through larger automated plants where labor requirements are lower. Looking to the future, it is probable that we shall witness a continual and gradual decline in the amount of raw wood harvested in the county with consequent effect on employment statistics. The rate of decline in the number of jobs is almost certain to exceed the decrease in wood volume utilized. The following tabulation shows the number of workers employed in lumber and wood products, 1959-66:

	Number		*Number*
1959	12,700	1963	10,600
1960	11,500	1964	10,800
1961	10,300	1965	9,600
1962	10,800	1966	9,100

Apart from wood manufacturing enterprises of various sorts, we have a local fishing industry of considerable importance and even greater potential. There are two moderate-sized wholesalers buying fish in Eureka; only one has a canning facility. The rest of the fish caught is shipped fresh or frozen for immediate sale or canning elsewhere.

Dairying is a flourishing business but relatively static and with little growth potential. Row crops, such as potatoes, are beginning to appear in Humboldt County, but slowly. The region is well suited to production of vegetables, but distance to market has been an adverse factor.

The port facilities at Humboldt Bay are capable of handling deep sea vessels of up to 12,000 gross tons, but traffic in the port is limited to in-shipments of oil and chemical products and to out-shipments of wood products. It is nevertheless true that Humboldt Bay as a port, Pacific shipping point, shipbuilding center, and general transport terminal for oceangoing vessels possesses great potential for growth and constitutes one of the best hopes for the region's economic future generally.

Employment Considerations

Table 1 summarizes the recent employment situation in the county.

TABLE 1.—Total labor force, total employed, and unemployment rates, 1959-65

Item	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965
Total labor force [1]	39,800	40,400	39,600	39,900	40,000	40,100	41,000
Total employed [2]	37,700	37,000	35,600	36,600	36,600	37,200	37,600
Unemployment rate	*Pct.* 5.0	*Pct.* 8.4	*Pct.* 10.4	*Pct.* 8.2	*Pct.* 8.5	*Pct.* 7.4	*Pct.* 8.5

[1] Employed and unemployed.

[2] Includes wage and salary workers, self-employed, unpaid family workers, and domestics.

Source: California Department of Employment, Research & Statistics.

Recent figures on unemployment in the county are incomplete but it might be of interest to note that while national unemployment figures were dropping to their lowest in 13 years (3.8 percent in the first quarter of 1966) the rate of unemployment in Humboldt County for the same period was 11.6 percent or almost three times the national average.

Mention should be made at this point of the seasonal nature of the unemployment picture in these parts. Table 2 summarizes the plight that we face.

TABLE 2.—Bimonthly employment rate in Humboldt County, 1964-66

Period	1964	1965	1966
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Jan.-Feb.	11.8	[1] 13.3	11.6
Mar.-Apr.	7.3	8.2	6.0
May-June	5.4	6.2	4.5
July-Aug.	4.6	5.0	5.2
Sept.-Oct.	4.3	5.3	5.7
Nov.-Dec.	[1] 10.5	9.6	([2])

[1] Flood. [2] Not available.

Reasons for the rather alarming fluctuations can be found in the fact that logging operations proceed with greatest vigor during the summer months, coming to a virtual halt during the rainy months, December to March; and secondly, in the seasonal rush of tourists who come to the redwood region in considerable numbers in the summer (June to September) but not at all in the winter months. Both these factors lend themselves to the boom-or-bust type of economy which seems to be traditional with primary producing, single-industry economies such as we have here in northwest California.

The Welfare Load

As might be expected, an area with severe employment difficulties such as prevail in Humboldt County gets more than its share of human misery. Migratory workers, squatters, perennial welfare recipients, dependent families whose breadwinner has gone elsewhere, probably in despair, find this area, its mild climate, reasonable facilities, and the number of places to hide that it contains somewhat ideal as a human refuge. People here have a long acquaintance with the down-and-outer, he's been a part of this region since its brash and brisk beginning. If doubt exists on this point, an examination of the number of flourishing loan companies that have offices here will perhaps dispel doubt.

I can do no better here than quote some of the remarks of the Humboldt County 1966 grand jury on the subject of welfare in Humboldt County. They summarize the situation quite well and make corrective suggestions that appear to have real merit.

> Of the total amount of money budgeted for welfare in the county in 1965-66, $7.7 million, approximately 39 percent, came from Federal funds, 42 percent from State funds, and 19 percent from the county. Approximately 9.4 percent of the county tax dollar went for public welfare compared with a State average of 6 percent. Humboldt County's unstable labor market and relatively low tax base appear to be the most likely reasons for Humboldt's welfare costs being higher than the State average.
>
> The most startling discovery this committee has made in studying the welfare program is the lack of preventive and corrective services being provided by the county. Because of the meager income with which the needy are provided while on public assistance, few are able to do more than barely survive; and the meagerness itself helps to perpetuate the person's dependence on public assistance. A person living as marginally as those on public assistance must find it difficult to even look for a job since his car is likely to be undependable and his clothing less than pleasant to look at. He cannot own personal property, including insurance (but excluding household goods) worth more than $600, ($1,200 if on old age assistance or aid to the needy blind) or he must go off public assistance. The county general relief requirements specify that his car must be at least 5 years old. His confidence and self-concept become progressively more shattered as he becomes dependent on welfare.
>
> It is our recommendation, therefore, that all positive measures must be taken to break the vicious chain of poverty, dependence, and delinquency which is passed on from generation to generation. The welfare programs as they now stand are stopgap measures at best, and must be continued (for both moral and legal reasons) but even at the risk of incurring greater expense temporarily, more must be done to aid both welfare recipients and potential welfare recipients to become productive members of society such as ours, one in which automation is going to cause progressively higher unemployment. We must face the need to bring every individual into focus with society or find him a burden on law enforcement or other public agencies.
>
> To help achieve this end, we recommend:
>
> The continuation and expansion of preventive and corrective services which now exist. These include:
>
> Homemaker service. The county now has four homemakers who aid approximately 35 homes per month.
>
> Counseling service. This is obligatory under present programs, but the quality is variable depending on the ability of the worker.
>
> Job training. At present this is being done primarily under the Manpower Development and Training Act.*

---

* Recent letters from both the Labor Department in Washington and Sacramento indicate that the funds supporting this program will end in mid-1967.

Public works project program. In 1965, 111 welfare recipients participated in this program.

Cooperation with Headstart and other programs for the culturally deprived.

The Existence of Poverty in Humboldt County

The standards for measuring poverty are uniquely various and imperfect and none seems completely able to describe the despair and abject misery of those thus blighted in their hopes and human aspirations. It seems, however, that the propensity for quantification being what it is, we seem most able to agree on what poverty is when we speak in dollars and cents and so that's what we will attempt to do.

Using U.S. Bureau of the Census figures in part, the following tabulation tells some of the story for Humboldt County:

	1960	1964
Median income	$6,282	NA (though doubtless higher)
Percentage of all employees earning less than $3,000	13.6	(less than $2,500) 16.6 (less than $4,000) 14.1
Percentage earning more than $10,000	16.8	19.5
Aggregate income for entire population	$215 million	$259 million

It seems to be the old story all over again—"the rich get richer, the poor get poorer" or "them that has, gets." The number of poor people, that is, those below the $3,000 figure, has almost doubled in a 5-year period until today about one-third of the population of the county falls within that opprobrious category. We are talking about approximately 30,000 people when we mention the word poverty in this area and that's a shattering indictment of both the region and its people, of which I'm one.

Concluding Remarks

Our basic problem is overdependence on one industry whose labor needs and production techniques are changing. Essentially, we have a one-horse economy; when it's up and running, times are good. When the market slumps, as just recently with the slowdown in construction, it's frankly Doomsville for an awful lot of good people.

The obvious solution, of course, is to diversify and thereby make the economy more resilient. If we could can our own fish, make our own wood into panels, furniture, pallets, and so on, grow tea, asparagus, cut flowers, use our port to ship commodities to the world's markets, create a national park in the redwoods to attract more tourists—if we could do all this, we'd be less vulnerable, more able to support those who live and hope to work here and take care of those who can't. The potential, the resources, the people are here. The thing we lack most is capital and imagination. I sincerely hope we find them soon.

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY HENRY OLOHI, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, CONFEDERATED TRIBES, COLVILLE RESERVATION, NESPELEM, WASH.

Mr. Will Clegg, U. of Utah, asked me to state if OEO helps the Indian and how it helps.

Yes it does help very much and I hope there will always be OEO.

We have not had much help yet though, but it is our fault. But my friends at Lummi and Tulalip and Swinomish, also some in Montana such as Flathead, Blackfeet, and Nez Perce say that good things are taking place because of OEO.

One good thing already done for all Indians in Washington is a book put out by U. of Utah and OEO showing all companies, bureaus etc., such as Public Health, Public Welfare, Public Schools, Rehab. agency, Employment office and so forth which are supposed to help Indians like they help the non-Indian. This is good news for us because we did not know these people supposed to help. Now we know them, they know us and we will be able to get help from these people. So far, this does not cost us or Sargent Shriver any money because these companies and so forth are already in operation in this State and ready to help us. This is one good thing OEO has done already for us and we are not yet hooked up with OEO yet.

We want to get Health Aids and Study Halls and some help in getting jobs for fathers. We know OEO is doing these things for other Indians and they are happy and healthy. I hope that OEO stays here a long time because all the things we know about OEO are good things which the Indian needs. The Indian will help himself if he gets a chance and this is a good chance as I see it.

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY MOSE E. PARRIS, PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE, INDIAN HEALTH AREA OFFICE, PHOENIX, ARIZ.

This paper is concerned mainly with the present conditions, innovations, and process of change in rural poverty in Indian societies for a four-State area, Nevada, California, Arizona, and Utah. When the term "societies" is used in the plural term, we are speaking of traditional, moderate, and progressive society groups on any one Indian reservation. Generalizations used in programing activities affecting Indian people cannot be accurate to involve the total population.

The present programs ongoing in these four States, administered by Federal, State, and county, all differ in many respects due to the historical setting. Although the Indian villages and communities are far from ancient, there are few that are sophisticated in a modern sense. However, you will find that the people have initiated many forms of industrial activities on their own. In spite of recent changes in their population and social systems, it can be said that with technical assistance the social and economic growth will develop into a highly commercialized economic base.

Geographical

Indians of these four States—Nevada, California, Arizona, and Utah—have been abundantly blessed and more often cursed by nature. These areas contain fertile farmlands, valleys, and mountain ranges, interspersed with barren waste, volcanic rocks, and fortunately some virgin timbers.

1. Economic development is a potential if the training and assistance are provided by a policy built around the many ideas of the Indians.
2. Employment needs could be solved and distributed throughout the reservation areas with the aid and coordination of the Indian people and Federal agencies.
3. Improved standard of living, housing, and sanitation will result from training and teaching programs under OEO, BIA, and PHS assistance.

Social Structure

In many instances the Indian communities are separated from each other and from non-Indian communities as a whole by geographic, linguistic, and cultural differences.

The Indians of these four States with the present programs and their own initiative are rapidly moving toward a commercial and industrious economy, with a mobile social structure.

In language, social and political organizations, and values, the Indian people, although in the past were dependent on governmental assistance, represent quite distinct modes of living. This fact constitutes one of the major dilemmas now faced by the Indian people in striving for national unity and social and economic progress—goals which were given constant lip service, but now at least are becoming policies.

Present Trends of Innovations

Today, by the technological skills being brought to the reservations, there are few communities that are touched. On-the-job training plants, such as electronics, diamond cutting, garment making, home health aids, health records, and others, have penetrated to the remote areas. More important, there has been a change in land leasing, land ownership, and legal services. This is being matched by technical assistance programs toward the demand for a more mobile society and provision of skilled craftsmen and sales of Indian-made goods. On the other hand, Indian people seeking such skills off-reservation do not forget the relatives and friends where they grew up. Therefore, a continuous process of training and developments in the rural areas must go on to elevate those at home out of poverty.

Developing New Leadership

The making of decisions in most matters of reservation concern is almost wholly vested in the tribal councils. The direct supervision of programs for the Indian people is seldom in the hands of Indian leaders. Most of the present supervisors previously had experience in outside programs.

Training programs under the OEO and other Federal agencies share in the leadership developments to place eventually total involvement by the local participants.

New projects of concern need to seek this type of Indian leadership for transferring the operation to a community incorporating and coordinating their own ideas. As a first step, it is necessary to establish some local group, as representative as possible, with which it could share the power of making decisions. Because of their knowledge and experience in Indian communities, it is well to select them to assist the projects in directing the economic and social affairs of the reservation. As this group develops greater skill, more and more responsibility can be delegated to it. The leaders with technical advisers meet in periodic sessions, conferences, and workshops. With friendly guidance, they soon will develop a broader perspective.

Health and Education

In the whole process of changing practices and perspectives within the Indian communities, health education and enlightenment have played the key role. Perhaps the most significant change that has occurred on the reservations is the education for the young children in Headstart. Need for a carefully designed health and educational program both formal and informal was and still is essential. There is the need to diagnose the community aspirations to achieve and form the motivating devices of the local groups.

There is a constant need for developing and building knowledge, skills, and attitudes which will in turn foster in it a solid and self-reliant growth. This growth can only come or take place through healthy bodies and minds.

There is the need for involvement of parents who in the past might have resisted such ideas of providing education for their children.

There is the need to make applicable techniques in preparing effective teachers, physicians, and aids, who often are not qualified and knowledgeable in the Indian field.

There is a need for improved and adequate facilities to attract qualified and conscientious teachers, physicians, and other personnel to accept appointments to these locations.

Proposed training projects for members of the Indian communities in organizations, supervision, building skills, and others that add to the occupational inventory, would increase the economy as well as the knowledge of the people.

Approach for the Future

When respect is granted, it will be returned. Therefore, if allowed to share in the making of decisions, shaping their destiny and molding a future, the Indians will take responsibility and pride in making and carrying them out. Cultural and educational intervention to all problems, as well as technological and economic intervention approach, will open the way for elevating the Indian people and rural communities to a higher level of living. (The Indian people involved in determining their needs, planning, conducting programs, and evaluating, leads to a sound community action approach utilizing all available resources.)

One basic conclusion is that the Indian reservations have a great potential for development and for becoming a progressive and dynamic part of this great nation. Certainly, they have a great human resource. This development could take place without the loss of certain values that are deeply ingrained in Indian society.

Respectfully submitted by Mose E. Parris, Area Tribal Affairs Officer, Division of Indian Health, Phoenix, Arizona, in the interest of the Indian people as an individual member.

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY WALTER RICHTER, DIRECTOR, SOUTHWEST REGION (TEXAS) OEO

FACTS ABOUT POVERTY IN RURAL TEXAS

Texas has long been proud of its high ranking among States in natural resources, industrial production, and other areas. It is not so proud of its spot well up the ladder on the index of low income families, both urban and rural.

Two sociologists at Texas A & M University—William P. Kuvlesky and David E. Wright—have clearly established through their research that Texas has higher rates of both rural and urban poverty than the nation as a whole.

Furthermore, they found that the incidence of poverty was almost twice as high in rural Texas as in the State's cities and metropolitan areas.

I would like to quote excerpts from their study, "Poverty in Texas: The Distribution of Low Income Families," published in October 1965, and based on data from the 1960 Federal census.

What is the magnitude of poverty in Texas?

A comparison of the United States and Texas on the proportion of total urban and rural families having incomes of less than $3,000 in 1960 showed that Texas led the nation in rural low income families by 43.5 percent to 33.7 percent; in urban low income families by 23.8 percent and 16.4 percent; and in total rural and urban low income families by 28.8 percent to 21.4 percent.

Quoting from the study by Kuvlesky and Wright:

> Well over one-fourth of the families in Texas were living in poverty in 1960. Although Texas had higher rates of both rural and urban poverty than the nation as a whole, it can be seen that the incidence of poverty among families was almost twice as high for rural Texas as compared to urban Texas. Of all the family poverty in the State, 38 percent of the State's families lived in rural places. Poverty is a serious problem in urban and rural areas alike, but, poverty appears to be a more pressing problem in the countryside than it is in the city. . . .

Kuvlesky and Wright found that in one-fourth of the Texas counties 50 percent or more of the families were poor. And in approximately 60 percent of the counties at least one-third of the families were poor—a level of poverty that exceeds the national level by 10 percent. Put simply, three-fifths of all Texas counties had much greater poverty than the nation as a whole.

> Although the magnitude of poverty varied greatly from county to county, certain broad patterns can be clearly observed. Most obvious is the regional pattern showing that most of the counties in the eastern and southern portions of Texas had high levels of poverty, while in the Panhandle and West Texas high poverty levels were not common.
>
> The largest regional pattern of poverty consisted of nearly all the counties in the South Texas Plains, the Texas Prairies, and the East Texas Plains, and is roughly bordered on the west by the 99th meridian. The majority of Texas' poor families resided in this large and inclusive area. Within this depressed region there were two smaller areas which had more severe poverty rates than the rest of the region. One of these areas having severe levels of poverty extends from Shelby County on the Louisiana border westward to Comanche County, southward from Comanche to Goliad County, and then northeast through San Jacinto County and back to the Louisiana border. The other area having very severe rates of poverty is confined almost entirely to the counties in the South Texas Plains; several of the counties in this region are among the poorest in the nation.
>
> The 300 lowest ranking counties in the United States ordered by per capita income in 1959 (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census) lists Starr, Zapata, Zavala, Jim Hogg, Maverick, and Dimmit counties as being among the 300 poorest counties in the nation . . .
>
> In summary, it was observed that most of the counties having high levels of poverty were in east and south Texas; by comparison, there are fewer counties in west and north Texas having high poverty levels. What is more, the most severe poverty levels existed in the eastern and southern regions of the State. Also, we have indicated that Texas did have areas of marked affluence which were for the most part associated with large metropolitan areas. The ameliorating effect of large urban centers was further indicated by the observation that counties having large urban centers had proportionately less poverty than do neighboring counties.
>
> The observed patterns of county poverty levels can be used in planning for development programs in several ways. Obviously, they offer a basis for making rational judgments about priorities in allocating development resources. In addition, these patterns, when

> related to other relevant conditions, can serve as a basis for selection of appropriate large-scale treatment programs . . .

The fact that a large majority of the Texas population resides in urban places (75 percent in 1960) should not lead anyone to believe that rural poverty in Texas is not important.

Thirty-eight percent of all the poor families in Texas—1 out of every 10 families that lived in the State in 1960—lived in rural areas. These 261,435 families are a significant part of our citizenry. Texas in 1967 had 71 counties that were entirely rural and two-thirds of these had high levels of poverty.

To determine the general differences in poverty levels associated with rurality of residence, Kuvlesky and Wright compared family income distributions among populations living in all-rural counties, nonmetropolitan counties of mixed rural and urban character, and metropolitan counties. They concluded that as one moved from the all-rural to the metropolitan counties the magnitude of poverty decreased markedly.

Their findings clearly demonstrated that higher rates of poverty existed among rural families than among urban families for the vast majority of counties.

In summary, Kuvlesky and Wright stated:

> The information given above clearly indicates that poverty was more prevalent among rural people than among their urban neighbors for the great majority of counties in Texas. In addition, as a result of further analysis, it appears that the greater the rural-urban differential in the direction of higher rates of rural poverty, the more severe was the general income deprivation suffered by the rural people. A marked tendency can be observed for the proportion of rural families experiencing extreme poverty (family incomes of less than $2,000) to increase as the rural-urban ratio increases. Conversely, an opposite trend can be observed in reference to the proportion of rural families having an income of $5,000 or more. . . .

Kuvlesky and Wright stated that old age and nonwhite and Spanish descent are conditions which have been associated with high levels of family poverty. They observed that in Texas counties which had high levels of poverty there were above-average proportions of elderly, nonwhite, and Spanish-speaking persons.

The relative lack of existing organization among the rural poor makes rural poverty in Texas a crucial concern today. There are usually a large number of organizations, public and private, that function to advise and serve the urban poor. Kuvlesky and Wright concluded that helping the rural poor presents greater problems than helping the urban poor, and rural poverty should receive at least as much attention as urban poverty.

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY PHIL WARREN, SHOSHONE & ARAPAHOE TRIBES, FORT WASHAKIE, WYO.

Right now we are just starting with OEO but we know it is a wonderful thing for the Indian in these parts and I know that other Indians hope that OEO stays here a long time because this is not just one more thing from Uncle Sam but something good.

U. of Utah and OEO showed us how to make a survey of all our reservation and this is a good thing, because we see there are many people suffering that we did not know about before this time. Even if OEO won't help us we know we will do something about these people even if we are poor ourselves.

But we hope that OEO will do like they are doing for other Indians like training health aids so our children can be healthy and our homes will be nice and clean, and we had a Headstart here last summer and now we hope that we can get a summer school camp for our teenage children so they will not be slow in school.

Some of our young people are in NYL and this is a good thing too because they can make a little money for themselves and they feel good about this.

If OEO will help us like it helps other Indians the men on the reservation can learn how to get a job and also how to stay on the job and the families can beat poverty this way too.

I hope you will vote for OEO because we all think it is a good thing for the Indians here and we know it is a good thing for the Indians here and we know it is already a good thing in Montana because my friends up there told me about it.

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY WM. W. WELSH, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, MOHAVE COUNTY (ARIZ.) DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL

NARRATIVE REPORT FOR CAP APPLICATION: PROBLEMS, HISTORY, PROJECTED GOALS OF M.C.A.D.C., INC.

In addition to the impacted areas of poverty and rural poverty, scattered throughout the 13,000 square miles of Mohave County, there are many and varied problems facing the county at this time, not the least of which is a population explosion, which, of course, brings its own unique problems, such as unemployment, inadequate housing, lack of proper school facilities, and county and city government problems to serve an ever-increasing population.

Among the problems of the county as a whole are those of flood control, lack of water and sewage facilities, and many other problems related directly or indirectly to the poverty program, as well as to other Federal, State, and local agencies, which must be brought into operation, and which were specifically designed to be integrated into, and coordinated with, the local community action agency.

Insofar as first things must always be done first in county or community planning and development, the Mohave County Area Development Council, Inc. has, in many instances, not only initiated the first steps to be taken, but has outlined procedures to be followed, which many times has proven to be the "spark plug" by which progress became feasible and possible.

In this connection, as early as July 1962, the development council was organized, and immediately started preparing an overall economic opportunity program, which was submitted and approved by Washington as of December 6, 1963. In March of 1965, the development council was incorporated, which thus enabled it to enter into contracts with the Federal, State, and county Governments, and particularly to enter into a contract with OEO whereby the council became the community action agency for Mohave County, with the approval of the board of supervisors.

Because Mohave County was ready with a comprehensive planning ordinance with provisions for zoning, the State Bureau of Land Management office and the Department of the Interior selected Mohave County as one of the pilot study areas in the United States for the evaluation of Federal lands under the new Public Land Sales Act and the Land Laws Review Commission.

In addition, Mohave County was one of four counties in Arizona earlier designated by the former ARA as a redevelopment area and was selected by the Department of Agriculture as a pilot county (see letters from extension economist, Dr. Clarence Edmond, and Fred Weiler of BLM).

Under the Public Works and Economic Development Act, Mohave County was again designated, but was de-designated June 30, 1966, along with Apache, Coconino, and Navajo Counties. However, the Indian tribes within the counties have ultimately been re-designated. This fact qualifies Mohave County and Yuma County, together with their Indian tribes, to form an economic development district.

Having anticipated just such an eventuality, the development council has already prepared and submitted an overall economic development program for Mohave County, which was approved by the EDA office in Washington, but action will be withheld until Yuma County, and the Indian tribes involved, have submitted and gained approval of their OEDP's. In the meantime, it is certain that the development council will have prepared an OEDP for the proposed Colorado River and Western Arizona Economic Development District.

Approval of the proposed district will, in effect, give Mohave County, and communities within the county, the "priority" needed to take advantage of Federally funded programs which heretofore have been denied.

For instance, Mohave County made application last year for 701 project funds through HUD for the development of mapping and planning in the Kingman suburban area, Colorado City area, and the Mohave Valley-Bullhead City area. This has not yet been approved, but with the establishment of an economic development district, our priority rating will accelerate its approval in Washington.

On April 5, 1966, the county board of supervisors, acting on the recommendation of the development council, authorized the preparation of a comprehensive countywide plan for rural communities covering water and sewer requirements. As a result, these communities are now, or soon will be, in a position to request grants and loans from the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Farmers Home Administration, on planning and implementing, after they have determined their needs through their neighborhood councils working with the county board of supervisors and the planning and zoning commission. This would not be limited to water and sewer needs, but would also apply to road improvements, flood control, and other related projects of need.

With our previous "priority rating" under ARA and EDA, the development council, through its industrial committee, was successful in securing a grant for a feasibility study at the airport. As a result of this study, General Cable Co., in its search for a new site, is now planning for early construction of a $10 million plant at the airport. The establishment of this major industry into the area will undoubtedly attract more industry.

Mohave County is already the fastest growing area in Arizona, as shown by a recent study made by the State employment service, which will be a part of this application. Since 1960 Mohave County has gained in population from 7,700 to well over 18,000. The projected growth by 1975 is expected to accelerate to 50,000 persons. In fact, "growing pains" are already with us, as well as problems connected with this accelerated growth.

As a development council and as a community action agency for the entire county, it is the firm belief of our directors that money spent now to correct problems before they arise, along with those already existing, during this accelerated "growth period," will prevent very much costlier programs when this growth results in a hodgepodge such as that which now exists in the suburban east and west coast cities.

We feel certain that the officials of OEO are familiar with the many Federal grants, loans, and aids available through the many agencies and bureaus of the Government, which a rural and an underdeveloped area such as Mohave County could and would be able to develop and implement through a properly funded community action agency. We also feel that it must be realized and understood that the monumental task involved requires a well-staffed CAP, in order to correlate and coordinate all the available programs and resources—local, State, and Federal—for both the urban and rural areas of a county the size of the States of Massachusetts and Connecticut combined.

Not only is Mohave County the third largest county in the continental United States, but the communities are widely separated. For instance, the "Strip Area" which lies north of the Colorado River, is approximately 325 miles from Kingman. The shortest route to the Strip Area necessitates traveling through two States, Nevada and Utah, and re-entering Arizona twice. This is ordinarily a 3-day trip.

Mohave County has some 1,000 miles of shoreline along the Colorado River and three man-made lakes located along the river. Add to this, that another dam is under construction in the southernmost part of the county, on the Bill Williams River some 200 miles from Kingman, and one would begin to get some idea of the magnitude of our county.

It has been clearly established by the Grass Roots effort here that education and training to take advantage of employment opportunities is basic, not only to the alleviation of poverty and substandard living conditions, but to its prevention in the Kingman suburban area and rural communities. This applies particularly to the Indians, both on and off the reservation, and to our Mexican-American population.

Apathy and frustration on the part of the Indians, as revealed by our Grass Roots workers, is evidenced by the high suicide rate among the Hualapais, which is among the highest in the nation. Almost every Indian family qualifies for the poverty program. Their housing here in Kingman is deplorable—no inside toilet facilities, and only a few houses are equipped with even cold water. On the reservation, conditions are certainly no better. Over 900 Hualapais live in fewer than 100 shacks, ranging in size from about 216 square feet to approximately 900 square feet.

On the other hand, the Mexican American and rural Anglo population are motivated by a fierce pioneer pride. Not only do they not possess the education and training to better their environment and living conditions, but resent being "classified" as poverty people. Therefore, the community action role here is a very "touchy" one, which can only be approached with tact, understanding, and much patience. A partial breakthrough has been accomplished, first, by our Headstart and NYC programs, and then by Operation Grass Roots. There still remains much to be done.

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY ANGUS A. WILSON, CHAIRMAN, NEZ PERCE TRIBAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, LAPWAN, IDAHO

On behalf of the Nez Perce Tribe of Idaho I would like to extend our deep and sincere gratitude for the very able assistance provided to our tribal community action program by the Bureau of Indian Services, Department of Continuing Education of your University.

After contacting other various tribes in the northwest on their OEO programs it was generally agreed that the services offered and made available by the Bureau proved invaluable towards the success of the many varied programs on each reservation. The tribe will be forever thankful for these available services concerning poverty programs on our reservation.

Again the tribe would like to continue being proud recipients of the valuable services and benefits of the University and the Bureau of Indian Services.

☆ U.S. Government Printing Office: 1967—266-162